

CONGRESSIONAL QUARTERLY Weekly Report

REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED IN WHOLE OR IN PART

VOL. XVII
PAGES 1393-1421

No. 42

WEEK ENDING OCT. 16, 1959

CONTENTS

| | <u>Page</u> |
|-----------------------|-------------|
| What's Ahead | ii |
| Pressures On Congress | 1405 |
| Committee Roundup | 1408 |
| Political Notes | 1409 |
| Presidential Report | 1413 |
| Around The Capitol | 1415 |
| Week In Congress | iv |

Party Unity

Parties Took Opposing Stands on 50% of Roll Calls

Page 1393

- | | <u>Page</u> |
|------------------------------------|-------------|
| ● Nuclear Hazards | 1398 |
| ● Civil Defense | 1403 |
| ● Lobby Rules Dispute | 1405 |
| ● GOP Policy Goals | 1409 |
| ● Open and Closed Hearings . . . | 1420 |
| ● The Congressional Record | 1415 |
| ● Highway Allocations | 1417 |

COPYRIGHT 1959

BY CONGRESSIONAL QUARTERLY INCORPORATED

The Authoritative Reference on Congress

1156 NINETEENTH STREET, N. W. • WASHINGTON 6, D. C. • STerling 3-8060



What's Ahead?

Dates are listed as released by sources and are sometimes subject to change.

Committee Hearings

- Oct. 20-31 -- ALASKA TRANSPORTATION PROBLEMS (S 1507, 2451, 2452, 2514, others), Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce. Field hearings: Ketchikan -- Oct. 20-21; Juneau -- Oct. 22-23; Anchorage -- Oct. 24-27; Seward -- Oct. 28; Fairbanks -- Oct. 29-31.
- Oct. 23-Dec. 11 -- PROBLEMS OF THE AGED AND AGING, Senate Labor and Public Welfare, Subcommittee on Problems of the Aged and Aging. Field hearings: Pittsburgh -- Oct. 23-24; San Francisco -- Oct. 28-29; Charleston, W.Va. -- Nov. 5; Grand Rapids -- Nov. 16-17; Miami -- Dec. 1-2; Detroit -- Dec. 10-11.
- Oct. 26 -- UNEMPLOYMENT STUDY, Senate Unemployment Problems. Field hearing: Altoona, Pa. -- Oct. 26.
- Oct. 26-Dec. 8 -- WATER RESOURCES AND NEEDS, Senate Select Natural Water Resources. Field hearings: South Dakota -- Oct. 26-27; Detroit -- Oct. 29; Philadelphia -- Oct. 30; Topeka -- Nov. 18; Des Moines -- Nov. 19; Salt Lake City -- Nov. 23; Alexandria, La. -- Nov. 30; Columbia, S.C. -- Dec. 2; Jacksonville -- Dec. 3; Augusta, Maine -- Dec. 7; Boston -- Dec. 8.
- Nov. 4 -- SOCIAL SECURITY DISABILITY PROGRAM, House Ways and Means, Administration of the Social Security Laws Subc.
- Nov. 9 -- MASS TRANSPORTATION SURVEY AND PLAN REPORT, Joint Committee on Washington Metropolitan Problems.
- Nov. 10, 12 -- CONSERVATION OF FISH IN COLUMBIA RIVER BASIN (S Con Res 35, S 1420, S 2586), Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce. Field hearings: Astoria, Ore. -- Nov. 10; Lewiston, Idaho -- Nov. 12.
- Nov. 16-Dec. 18 -- INCOME TAX SYSTEM, House Ways and Means.
- Nov. 30 -- DRUG INDUSTRY MONOPOLY, Senate Judiciary, Antitrust and Monopoly Subc.
- Oct. 23-24 -- INDEPENDENT AMERICAN FORUM AND NEW PARTY RALLY, sponsored by the Independent American, Chicago.
- Oct. 26 -- GENERAL AGREEMENT ON TARIFFS AND TRADE, ministerial meeting, Under Secretary of State Douglas Dillon to attend, Tokyo.
- Oct. 26-27 -- INDEPENDENT PETROLEUM ASSN. OF AMERICA, annual meeting, Dallas.
- Oct. 28 -- TRADE RELATIONS COUNCIL OF THE U.S., first national conference, The Plaza, New York.
- Oct. 28-30 -- NATIONAL RECLAMATION ASSN., 28th annual meeting, Shirley-Savoy Hotel, Denver.
- Nov. 3 -- ELECTIONS in several states for state legislatures, municipal government; gubernatorial elections in Kentucky, Mississippi.
- Nov. 3 -- RICHARD A. MACK, THURMAN WHITESIDE, retrial begins.
- Nov. 4-6 -- PUBLIC RELATIONS SOCIETY OF AMERICA INC., 12th national conference, Miami Beach.
- Nov. 6-7 -- COMMONWEALTH PARLIAMENTARY ASSN., Sen. Hugh Scott (R Pa.) delegate, Canberra, Australia.
- Nov. 6-12 -- NATIONAL ASSN. OF REAL ESTATE BOARDS, 52nd annual convention, Toronto, address by Sen. John J. Sparkman (D Ala.), Nov. 11.
- Nov. 9 -- AFL-CIO INDUSTRIAL UNION DEPT., Third Constitutional Convention, Statler Hotel, Washington.
- Nov. 9-17 -- NATIONAL GRANGE, 93rd annual convention, Long Beach, Calif.
- Nov. 15-19 -- NATIONAL MILK PRODUCERS FEDERATION, 43rd annual convention, Washington.
- Nov. 16-18 -- NATIONAL FOREIGN TRADE COUNCIL INC., 46th national convention, Waldorf-Astoria, New York.
- Nov. 29-Dec. 2 -- AMERICAN MUNICIPAL CONGRESS, 36th annual conference, address by Sen. John F. Kennedy (D Mass.), Denver.
- Nov. 29-Dec. 4 -- INVESTMENT BANKERS ASSN. OF AMERICA, annual convention, Bal Harbour, Fla.
- Dec. 5 -- LOUISIANA GUBERNATORIAL PRIMARY, Democratic.
- Dec. 12-16 -- NATIONAL FOOD BROKERS ASSN., 56th annual convention, Chicago.
- Dec. 13-17 -- AMERICAN FARM BUREAU FEDERATION, annual meeting, Chicago.
- Jan. 5-8 -- NATIONAL COUNCIL OF FARMER COOPERATIVES, 31st annual meeting, Biltmore Hotel, Atlanta.
- Jan. 18-20 -- NATIONAL CANNERS ASSN., annual convention, Miami Beach.
- Feb. 8 -- AFL-CIO, annual winter meeting, Miami Beach.

Other Events

- Oct. 18-21 -- NATIONAL ASSN. OF FOOD CHAINS, annual meeting, Sheraton Park and Shoreham Hotels, Washington.
- Oct. 19 -- NATIONAL PUBLIC HEALTH ASSN., annual meeting, address by Gov. Nelson Rockefeller (R N.Y.), Atlantic City.
- Oct. 20 -- INLAND PRESS ASSN., address by Gov. Nelson Rockefeller (R N.Y.), Chicago.
- Oct. 20 -- NATIONAL PETROLEUM COUNCIL, annual meeting, Washington.

CONGRESSIONAL QUARTERLY

A service for editors and standard reference on U.S. Congress

Editor and President: Henrietta and Nelson Poynter.

Executive Editor: Thomas N. Schroth.

Senior Writers: David S. Broder, Mary W. Cohn, William A. Karns, Helene C. Monberg, Spencer A. Rich, John E. Skuce, George C. Wilson.

Research Writers: Stephen Chatrnick, Ruth Hussey, Jerry Jarvis, Eleanor King, Gladys Miller, Shirley Seib, Edward T. Walsh.

C.Q. Almanac Editor: Georgianna F. Rothbus.

Editorial Assistants: Judy Kazan, Jonas V. Morris, Roberta Russell, Wayne Walker.

Publisher: Buel F. Weare.

Business Manager: Walter E. Thomas.

Production Supervisor: Walter W. Conklin Jr.

Copyright 1959 by Congressional Quarterly Inc., 1156 Nineteenth St. N.W., Washington 6, D.C. All reproduction rights, including quotation, broadcasting and publication, are reserved for current editorial clients. Second rights are reserved, including use of Congressional Quarterly material in campaign supplements, advertisements and handbooks without special permission. Rates are based on membership and/or circulation of clients and will be furnished on request. Second class postage paid at Washington, D.C.



PARTIES OPPOSED ON 50 PERCENT OF 1959 ROLL CALLS

Major findings of Congressional Quarterly's study of Party Unity in 1959 are as follows:

- Partisanship, as measured by the number of roll calls on which Democratic and Republican majorities disagreed, increased sharply from 1958 to 1959. The two majorities split on 50 percent of the 1959 roll calls, up from 42 percent in 1958 and equal to the 50 percent in 1956.
- Democrats, with two-to-one majorities in the 86th Congress, prevailed on 109 of the 151 partisan showdowns in 1959 -- on 72 of 103 in the Senate and 37 of 48 in the House.
- The average Democratic Member and the average GOP Member voted with his party majority 75 percent of the time and against it 16 percent of the time, when the two majorities were opposed. But House Democrats, as a group, scored significantly higher in Party Unity (79 percent) than did Senate Democrats (67 percent).

The Party Line

American political parties have never developed the strong sense of party discipline and unity to be found in the British House of Commons and some other parliamentary bodies. Although the Democratic or Republican line on a particular issue may be established in a party caucus, it is rarely a matter of official public knowledge. Party leaders in Senate and House may lay down a line in floor debate, but there is no assurance that a majority of their colleagues will follow them. In 1959, for example, Senate Majority Leader Lyndon B. Johnson (D Texas) found himself in the Democratic minority on 20 of the 103 showdown roll calls.

For this reason CQ uses the automatic device of selecting, as Party Unity roll calls, all votes in which the result shows a majority of one party in opposition to a majority of the other party. The respective majorities, of course, may and do range from unanimity to one more than one-half of the party members present and voting.

Defections cost both parties a number of potential victories in 1959, as follows:

- Of the 72 showdown votes in the Senate won by a Democratic majority and lost by a Republican majority, 29 might have been won by the latter but for the defection of one or more GOP Senators. One-half (15) of these roll calls were lost by three or fewer votes. The most costly, by far, was the Senate's refusal to confirm the nomination of Lewis L. Strauss to be Secretary of Commerce. The vote was 46-49 (D 15-47; R 31-2). Strauss would have been confirmed, 48-47, had Sens. Margaret Chase Smith (R Maine) and William Langer (R N.D.) voted with the majority of their GOP colleagues.

- Conversely, defections cost the Senate Democratic majority all of its 31 party-line losses to the GOP majority. The number of Democrats voting with the Republican, rather than Democratic, majority on these roll calls

Definitions

- **PARTY UNITY ROLL CALLS** -- Roll-call votes that split the parties, a majority of voting Democrats opposing a majority of voting Republicans. Roll calls on which either party divides evenly are excluded.
- **PARTY UNITY SCORES** -- Percentage of Party Unity roll calls on which a Member votes "yea" or "nay" in agreement with a majority of his party. Failures to vote, even if a Member announces his stand, lower his score. (For names of Members missing one or more 1958 roll calls because of their illness or illness or death in their families, see CQ Weekly Report p. 1363)
- **OPPOSITION TO PARTY SCORES** -- Percentage of Party Unity roll calls on which a Member votes "yea" or "nay" in disagreement with a majority of his party. A Member's Party Unity and Opposition to Party scores add to 100 percent only if he voted on all Party Unity roll calls.

ranged from nine to 28, but one half (16) of the roll calls were lost by five or fewer votes. The closest one, lost by one vote, occurred when the Senate agreed, 47-46 (D 15-44; R 32-2), to incorporate a "bill of rights" in the labor reform bill. More costly to the Democratic majority were its two failures to pass housing bills over the President's vetoes, both requiring two-thirds majorities. The first attempt failed by nine votes, 55-40 (D 53-10; R 2-30), the second by five votes, 58-36 (D 52-9; R 6-27).

- In the House, only three of the Republican majority's 37 losses might have been averted but for the defection of a minority of GOP Representatives. The only significant loss by defection came on passage of a public works bill over the President's veto, requiring a two-thirds majority. The bill was passed 280-121 (D 260-5; R 20-116), with 12 votes to spare, thanks to the defection of 20 Republicans.

- All 11 losses experienced in the House by the Democratic majority could be ascribed to defections. Minorities of four and six Democratic Representatives, respectively, accounted for failures to pass an REA bill and the first public works bill over the President's vetoes. On the other nine roll calls, however, the Democratic minority ranged in size from 60 to 137. The most significant loss by the Democratic majority came when the House voted 229-201 (D 95-184; R 134-17) for the Landrum-Griffin labor reform bill. A shift of 14 Democratic votes would have changed the outcome.

As in 1958, Party Unity and Opposition scores for individual Members show, particularly in the Senate, that liberals most closely reflect the views of the Democratic majority, while it is the conservatives who speak for the Republican majority.

Party Unity Scoreboard

The table below shows the proportion of Party Unity roll calls in 1959, 1958, 1957, and 1956:

| | Total Roll Calls | Party Unity Roll Calls | Percent of Total |
|---------------|---------------------|---------------------------|---------------------|
| 1959 | | | |
| BOTH CHAMBERS | 302 | 151 | 50% |
| Senate | 215 | 103 | 48 |
| House | 87 | 48 | 55 |
| 1958 | | | |
| BOTH CHAMBERS | 293 | 124 | 42% |
| Senate | 200 | 87 | 44 |
| House | 93 | 37 | 40 |
| 1957 | | | |
| BOTH CHAMBERS | 207 | 97 | 47% |
| Senate | 107 | 38 | 36 |
| House | 100 | 59 | 59 |
| 1956 | | | |
| BOTH CHAMBERS | 203 | 101 | 50% |
| Senate | 130 | 69 | 53 |
| House | 73 | 32 | 44 |

1959 Victories, Defeats

On the Party Unity roll calls of 1958 --

| | Senate | House | Total |
|------------------------|--------|-------|-------|
| Dems Won, GOP Lost | 72 | 37 | 109 |
| GOP Won, Dems Lost | 31 | 11 | 42 |
| Dems Voted Unanimously | 2 | 2 | 4 |
| GOP Voted Unanimously | 5 | 1 | 6 |

Party Scores

Party Unity and Opposition to Party scores below are composites of individual scores, and show the percentage of time the average Democrat and Republican voted with his party majority in disagreement with the other party's majority. Failures to vote tend to lower both Party Unity and Opposition to Party scores.

| | 1959 | | 85th CONGRESS | |
|----------------------------|------|-----|---------------|-----|
| | DEM. | GOP | DEM. | GOP |
| PARTY UNITY | | | | |
| Both Chambers | 75% | 75% | 69% | 66% |
| Senate | 67 | 72 | 69 | 66 |
| House | 79 | 77 | 68 | 66 |
| OPPOSITION TO PARTY | | | | |
| Both Chambers | 16% | 16% | 19% | 22% |
| Senate | 21 | 18 | 16 | 20 |
| House | 14 | 14 | 20 | 22 |

Regional Scores

Party Unity scores, by region, for 1959:

| | East | West | South | Midwest |
|--------------------|------|------|-------|---------|
| DEMOCRATS | | | | |
| Both Chambers | 79% | 79% | 66% | 81% |
| Senate | 72 | 73 | 57 | 74 |
| House | 81 | 88 | 71 | 83 |
| REPUBLICANS | | | | |
| Both Chambers | 74% | 77% | 73% | 77% |
| Senate | 75 | 77 | 70 | 68 |
| House | 73 | 77 | 74 | 81 |

Opposition to Party scores, by region, for 1959:

| | East | West | South | Midwest |
|--------------------|------|------|-------|---------|
| DEMOCRATS | | | | |
| Both Chambers | 15% | 8% | 25% | 12% |
| Senate | 16 | 11 | 33 | 17 |
| House | 10 | 5 | 21 | 10 |
| REPUBLICANS | | | | |
| Both Chambers | 18% | 14% | 19% | 14% |
| Senate | 19 | 14 | 24 | 18 |
| House | 17 | 14 | 17 | 11 |

Individual Scores

Highest Party Unity scorers -- those who voted with their party majority most consistently in 1959:

| SENATE | | | |
|-------------------|-----|---------------------|-----|
| Democrats | | Republicans | |
| Mansfield (Mont.) | 92% | Bush (Conn.) | 89% |
| Engle (Calif.) | 92 | Williams (Del.) | 88 |
| Hart (Mich.) | 90 | Cotton (N.H.) | 87 |
| Byrd (W.Va.) | 88 | Curtis (Neb.) | 87 |
| Morse (Ore.) | 88 | Martin (Iowa) | 85 |
| Proxmire (Wis.) | 86 | Hickenlooper (Iowa) | 85 |
| Carroll (Colo.) | 86 | Dirksen (Ill.) | 83 |
| Bartlett (Alaska) | 86 | Bennett (Utah) | 83 |
| McCarthy (Minn.) | 85 | Butler (Md.) | 83 |
| | | Morton (Ky.) | 83 |

| HOUSE | | | |
|-------------------|------|-------------------|------|
| Democrats | | Republicans | |
| Doyle (Calif.) | 100% | Ostertag (N.Y.) | 100% |
| Johnson (Calif.) | 100 | Ray (N.Y.) | 100 |
| Sisk (Calif.) | 100 | Wharton (N.Y.) | 98 |
| Inouye (Hawaii) | 100* | Mumma (Pa.) | 98 |
| Libonati (Ill.) | 100 | Younger (Calif.) | 96 |
| O'Hara (Ill.) | 100 | Budge (Idaho) | 96 |
| McCormack (Mass.) | 100 | Hoeven (Iowa) | 96 |
| Karsten (Mo.) | 100 | Cederberg (Mich.) | 96 |
| | | Devine (Ohio) | 96 |
| | | Alger (Texas) | 96 |
| | | Byrnes (Wis.) | 96 |

*Eligible for 11 Party Unity roll calls.

Highest Opposition to Party scorers -- those who voted against their party majority most consistently in 1959:

| SENATE | | | |
|------------------|-----|---------------|-----|
| Democrats | | Republicans | |
| Lausche (Ohio) | 83% | Langer (N.D.) | 67% |
| Byrd (Va.) | 72 | Javits (N.Y.) | 41 |
| Thurmond (S.C.) | 70 | Cooper (Ky.) | 36 |
| Robertson (Va.) | 64 | Young (N.D.) | 34 |
| Holland (Fla.) | 61 | Smith (Maine) | 29 |
| Stennis (Miss.) | 55 | Aiken (Vt.) | 29 |
| Eastland (Miss.) | 53 | Case (N.J.) | 27 |
| | | Scott (Pa.) | 26 |

| HOUSE | | | |
|----------------|-----|------------------|-----|
| Democrats | | Republicans | |
| Tuck (Va.) | 60% | Morrow (N.H.) | 60% |
| Abbitt (Va.) | 58 | O'Konski (Wis.) | 56 |
| Smith (Va.) | 56 | Corbett (Pa.) | 50 |
| Gary (Va.) | 56 | Rogers (Mass.) | 50 |
| Haley (Fla.) | 54 | Fulton (Pa.) | 48 |
| Murray (Tenn.) | 50 | Baldwin (Calif.) | 46 |
| Harrison (Va.) | 50 | Baker (Tenn.) | 44 |

Party Unity-Opposition Scores

Senate Party Unity - 1959 and 85th Congress

1. PARTY UNITY, 1959. Percentage of 103 Senate Party Unity roll calls on which Senator voted "yea" or "nay" in agreement with a majority of his party. (Party Unity roll calls are those on which a majority of voting Democrats opposed a majority of voting Republicans.) Failures to vote lower both Party Unity and Party Opposition scores.
2. PARTY OPPOSITION, 1959. Percentage of 103 Senate Party Unity roll calls on which Senator voted "yea" or "nay" in disagreement with a majority of his party. Failures to vote lower both Party Unity and Party Opposition scores.
3. PARTY UNITY, 85th Congress. Percentage of 125 Senate Party Unity roll calls in 1957 and 1958 on which Senator voted "yea" or "nay" in agreement with a majority of his party. Failures to vote lower both Party Unity and Party Opposition scores.
4. PARTY OPPOSITION, 85th Congress. Percentage of 125 Senate Party Unity roll calls in 1957 and 1958 on which Senator voted "yea" or "nay" in disagreement with a majority of his party. Failures to vote lower both Party Unity and Party Opposition scores.

HEADNOTES

*Not eligible for all 103 Party Unity roll calls in 1959; percentage score is based on number of votes for which Senator was eligible.

--Not a Senator in 1958.

‡ Score as Member of House of Representatives in 85th Congress.

| 1 2 3 4 | | | | | 1 2 3 4 | | | | | 1 2 3 4 | | | | | PARTY UNITY | | | | |
|--------------------|-----|-----|----|----|----------------------|----|----|----|----|-----------------------|----|----|----|----|-----------------------------------|----|----|----|----|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 1959 Session and 85th Congress | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 1 2 3 4 | | | | |
| ALABAMA | | | | | INDIANA | | | | | NEBRASKA | | | | | SOUTH CAROLINA | | | | |
| Hill | 79 | 15 | 89 | 9 | Hartke | 71 | 11 | -- | -- | Curtis | 87 | 12 | 85 | 12 | Johnston | 83 | 16 | 81 | 16 |
| Sparkman | 77 | 13 | 83 | 9 | Capehart | 52 | 19 | 66 | 6 | Hruska | 82 | 9 | 80 | 5 | Thurmond | 30 | 70 | 54 | 44 |
| ALASKA | | | | | IOWA | | | | | NEVADA | | | | | SOUTH DAKOTA | | | | |
| Bartlett | 86 | 11 | -- | -- | Hickenlooper | 85 | 7 | 87 | 7 | Bible | 64 | 23 | 76 | 14 | Case | 54 | 12 | 59 | 30 |
| Gruening | 81 | 7 | -- | -- | Martin | 85 | 7 | 85 | 9 | Cannon | 82 | 16 | -- | -- | Mundt | 72 | 25 | 76 | 22 |
| ARIZONA | | | | | KANSAS | | | | | NEW HAMPSHIRE | | | | | TENNESSEE | | | | |
| Hayden | 64 | 28 | 78 | 16 | Carlson | 69 | 14 | 70 | 14 | Bridges | 72 | 6 | 65 | 2 | Gore | 80 | 6 | 62 | 8 |
| Goldwater | 74 | 10 | 70 | 7 | Schoeppel | 76 | 12 | 74 | 7 | Cotton | 87 | 9 | 80 | 10 | Kefauver | 76 | 8 | 83 | 6 |
| ARKANSAS | | | | | KENTUCKY | | | | | NEW JERSEY | | | | | TEXAS | | | | |
| Fulbright | 55 | 21 | 65 | 11 | Cooper | 58 | 36 | 47 | 46 | Williams | 84 | 11 | -- | -- | Johnson | 75 | 20 | 77 | 11 |
| McClellan | 38 | 50 | 67 | 19 | Morton | 83 | 12 | 75 | 19 | Case | 67 | 27 | 51 | 46 | Yarborough | 84 | 3 | 73 | 1 |
| CALIFORNIA | | | | | LOUISIANA | | | | | NEW MEXICO | | | | | UTAH | | | | |
| Engle | 92 | 5 | 69 | 7 | Ellender | 58 | 24 | 61 | 22 | Anderson | 64 | 23 | 70 | 17 | Moss | 81 | 10 | -- | -- |
| Kuchel | 73 | 19 | 68 | 30 | Long | 69 | 10 | 75 | 10 | Chavez | 50 | 15 | 52 | 7 | Bennett | 83 | 7 | 78 | 5 |
| COLORADO | | | | | MAINE | | | | | NEW YORK | | | | | VERMONT | | | | |
| Carroll | 86 | 11 | 85 | 12 | Muskie | 71 | -- | -- | -- | Javits | 53 | 41 | 42 | 41 | Aiken | 61 | 29 | 51 | 46 |
| Allott | 79 | 17 | 79 | 13 | Smith | 71 | 47 | 58 | 42 | Keating | 75 | 24 | 77 | 16 | Prouty | 77 | 17 | 59 | 25 |
| CONNECTICUT | | | | | MARYLAND | | | | | NORTH CAROLINA | | | | | VIRGINIA | | | | |
| Dodd | 66 | 16 | -- | -- | Beall | 73 | 14 | 62 | 34 | Ervin | 52 | 42 | 75 | 18 | Byrd | 11 | 72 | 29 | 46 |
| Bush | 89 | 6 | 77 | 14 | Butler | 83 | 8 | 70 | 9 | Jordan | 53 | 33 | 53 | 35 | Robertson | 30 | 64 | 41 | 41 |
| DELAWARE | | | | | MASSACHUSETTS | | | | | NORTH DAKOTA | | | | | WASHINGTON | | | | |
| Frear | 44 | 35 | 50 | 22 | Kennedy | 70 | 9 | 70 | 10 | Langer | 24 | 67 | 18 | 57 | Jackson | 84 | 14 | 80 | 10 |
| Williams | 88 | 7 | 82 | 16 | Saltonstall | 78 | 18 | 74 | 15 | Young | 51 | 34 | 38 | 39 | Magnuson | 79 | 12 | 82 | 5 |
| FLORIDA | | | | | MICHIGAN | | | | | OHIO | | | | | WEST VIRGINIA | | | | |
| Holland | 33 | 61 | 51 | 27 | Hart | 90 | 9 | -- | -- | Lausche | 16 | 83 | 26 | 60 | Byrd | 88 | 10 | 65 | 19 |
| Smathers | 52 | 28 | 62 | 16 | McNamara | 83 | 9 | 79 | 16 | Young | 81 | 16 | -- | -- | Randolph | 80 | 13 | -- | -- |
| GEORGIA | | | | | MINNESOTA | | | | | OKLAHOMA | | | | | WISCONSIN | | | | |
| Russell | 33 | 46 | 66 | 26 | Humphrey | 69 | 8 | 76 | 14 | Kerr | 71 | 24 | 81 | 11 | Proxmire | 86 | 10 | 94 | 6 |
| Talmadge | 55 | 43 | 67 | 20 | McCarthy | 85 | 5 | 71 | 7 | Monroney | 83 | 8 | 74 | 8 | Wiley | 55 | 16 | 62 | 30 |
| HAWAII | | | | | MISSISSIPPI | | | | | OREGON | | | | | WYOMING | | | | |
| Long | 83* | 0* | -- | -- | Stennis | 39 | 53 | 57 | 25 | Morse | 88 | 5 | 86 | 8 | McGee | 77 | 6 | -- | -- |
| Fong | 67* | 33* | -- | -- | Eastland | 43 | 55 | 70 | 30 | Neuberger | 74 | 14 | 80 | 19 | O'Mahoney | 22 | 2 | 63 | 6 |
| IDAHOW | | | | | MISSOURI | | | | | PENNSYLVANIA | | | | | | | | | |
| Church | 69 | 10 | 80 | 10 | Hennings | 73 | 11 | 55 | 11 | Clark | 83 | 15 | 74 | 15 | | | | | |
| Duorsbak | 82 | 12 | 83 | 17 | Symington | 81 | 9 | 81 | 10 | Scott | 74 | 26 | 41 | 39 | | | | | |
| ILLINOIS | | | | | MONTANA | | | | | RHODE ISLAND | | | | | | | | | |
| Douglas | 78 | 16 | 82 | 18 | Mansfield | 92 | 2 | 92 | 6 | Green | 60 | 18 | 77 | 13 | | | | | |
| Dirksen | 83 | 7 | 86 | 9 | Murray | 43 | 0 | 67 | 5 | Pastore | 71 | 23 | 70 | 21 | | | | | |

Democrats in this type; Republicans in Italics

Party Unity-Opposition Scores

House Party Unity - 1959 and 85th Congress

1. PARTY UNITY, 1959. Percentage of 48 House Party Unity roll calls in 1959 on which Representative voted "yea" or "nay" in agreement with a majority of his party. (Party Unity roll calls are those on which a majority of voting Democrats opposed a majority of voting Republicans.) Failures to vote lower both Party Unity and Party Opposition scores.
2. PARTY OPPOSITION, 1959. Percentage of 48 House Party Unity roll calls in 1959 on which Representative voted "yea" or "nay" in disagreement with a majority of his party. Failures to vote lower both Party Unity and Party Opposition scores.
3. PARTY UNITY, 85th Congress. Percentage of 96 House Party Unity roll calls in 1957 and 1958 on which Representative voted "yea" or "nay" in agreement with a majority of his party. Failures to vote lower both Party Unity and Party Opposition scores.
4. PARTY OPPOSITION, 85th Congress. Percentage of 96 House Party Unity roll calls in 1957 and 1958 on which Representative voted "yea" or "nay" in disagreement with a majority of his party. Failures to vote lower both Party Unity and Party Opposition scores.

HEADNOTES

*Not eligible for all 48 Party Unity roll calls on 1959; percentage score is based on number of votes for which Representative was eligible.

--Not a Representative in 1958.

| 1 2 3 4 | | | | | 1 2 3 4 | | | | | 1 2 3 4 | | | | | PARTY UNITY | | | | |
|----------------------------|--|--|--|--|-------------------------|--|--|--|--|----------------------------|--|--|--|--|-----------------------------------|--|--|--|--|
| ALABAMA | | | | | 25 Kasem 94 2 -- -- | | | | | HAWAII | | | | | 1959 Session and 85th Congress | | | | |
| 3 Andrews 58 21 63 35 | | | | | 71 King 96 4 93 5 | | | | | AL Inouye 100* 0* -- -- | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 Boykin 71 6 50 17 | | | | | 26 Roosevelt 94 4 80 4 | | | | | IDAHO | | | | | | | | | |
| 7 Elliott 81 4 80 13 | | | | | 21 Hiestand 94 2 79 6 | | | | | 1 Pfost 96 4 88 11 | | | | | | | | | |
| 2 Grant 85 15 53 32 | | | | | 22 Holt 85 8 67 20 | | | | | 2 Budge 96 4 84 8 | | | | | | | | | |
| 9 Huddleston 87 10 78 22 | | | | | 18 Hosmer 77 17 70 20 | | | | | ILLINOIS | | | | | | | | | |
| 8 Jones 90 6 90 10 | | | | | 16 Jackson 69 2 63 14 | | | | | 25 Gray 85 4 80 14 | | | | | | | | | |
| 5 Rains 90 6 71 15 | | | | | 24 Lipscomb 94 4 85 15 | | | | | 21 Mack 92 6 80 20 | | | | | | | | | |
| 4 Roberts 79 6 72 17 | | | | | 15 McDonough 79 4 73 22 | | | | | 24 Price 96 4 88 13 | | | | | | | | | |
| 6 Selden 85 15 70 30 | | | | | 20 Smith 92 2 86 10 | | | | | 23 Shipley 94 4 -- -- | | | | | | | | | |
| ALASKA | | | | | COLORADO | | | | | 16 Allen 90 8 81 14 | | | | | | | | | |
| AL Rivers 98 2 -- -- | | | | | 4 Aspinall 92 2 73 9 | | | | | 17 Arends 90 8 70 20 | | | | | | | | | |
| ARIZONA | | | | | 2 Johnson 81 8 -- -- | | | | | 19 Chislerfield 83 12 81 5 | | | | | | | | | |
| 2 Udall 87 6 77 13 | | | | | 1 Rogers 92 8 84 13 | | | | | 14 Hoffman 94* 4* -- -- | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 Rhodes 83 10 61 32 | | | | | 3 Chenoweth 69 13 52 46 | | | | | 15 Mason 75 4 54 3 | | | | | | | | | |
| ARKANSAS | | | | | CONNECTICUT | | | | | 18 Michel 85 10 69 18 | | | | | IOWA | | | | |
| 5 Alfard 71 17 -- -- | | | | | 2 Bowles 90 2 -- -- | | | | | 20 Simpson 90 10 -- -- | | | | | 4 Carter 62 6 -- -- | | | | |
| 1 Gathings 69 27 58 40 | | | | | 1 Daddario 71 19 -- -- | | | | | 22 Springer 81 19 72 25 | | | | | 6 Coad 81 8 77 9 | | | | |
| 4 Harris 81 17 72 26 | | | | | 3 Giaimo 75 12 -- -- | | | | | Chicago-Cook County | | | | | 5 Smith 90 10 -- -- | | | | |
| 2 Mills 87 12 72 28 | | | | | 4 Irwin 81 19 -- -- | | | | | 12 Boyle 83 15 77 23 | | | | | 2 Wolf 79 10 -- -- | | | | |
| 6 Norrell 67 33 69 29 | | | | | AL Kowalski 90 8 -- -- | | | | | 1 Dawson 94 0 64 3 | | | | | 3 Gross 83 17 76 15 | | | | |
| 3 Trimble 94 6 80 7 | | | | | 5 Monagan 69 19 -- -- | | | | | 5 Kluczynski 92 0 82 14 | | | | | 8 Hoeven 96 4 71 16 | | | | |
| CALIFORNIA | | | | | DELAWARE | | | | | 7 Libonati 100 0 92 8 | | | | | 7 Jensen 79 15 71 25 | | | | |
| 7 Cohelan 92 4 -- -- | | | | | AL McDowell 87 10 -- -- | | | | | 3 Murphy 96 4 -- -- | | | | | 1 Schwengel 87 12 67 29 | | | | |
| 14 Hagen 83 10 81 18 | | | | | FLORIDA | | | | | 6 O'Brien 98 0 89 10 | | | | | KANSAS | | | | |
| 2 Johnson 100 0 -- -- | | | | | 2 Bennett 73 27 76 24 | | | | | 2 O'Hara 100 0 85 15 | | | | | 5 Breeding 85 15 82 10 | | | | |
| 11 McFall 94 6 89 9 | | | | | 4 Fascell 83 17 79 20 | | | | | 11 Pucinski 94 6 -- -- | | | | | 2 George 90 10 -- -- | | | | |
| 1 Miller (C.W.) 96 4 -- -- | | | | | 7 Haley 46 54 40 58 | | | | | 8 Rostenkowski 90 2 -- -- | | | | | 3 Hargis 92 4 -- -- | | | | |
| 8 Miller (G.P.) 75 4 71 5 | | | | | 5 Herlong 54 42 45 51 | | | | | 9 Yates 85 10 77 19 | | | | | 1 Avery 75 23 56 26 | | | | |
| 3 Moss 96 4 89 10 | | | | | 8 Matthews 79 21 65 33 | | | | | 13 Church 85 15 79 21 | | | | | 4 Rees 94 6 81 18 | | | | |
| 29 Saud 90 0 89 6 | | | | | 6 Rogers 71 29 66 34 | | | | | 10 Collier 90 8 78 16 | | | | | 6 Smith 79 17 56 25 | | | | |
| 5 Shelley 65 4 65 3 | | | | | 3 Sikes 54 21 66 26 | | | | | 4 Deruinski 69 8 -- -- | | | | | KENTUCKY | | | | |
| 27 Sheppard 73 6 68 8 | | | | | 1 Cramer 71 15 80 14 | | | | | INDIANA | | | | | 3 Burke 90 2 -- -- | | | | |
| 12 Sisk 100 0 88 11 | | | | | GEORGIA | | | | | 11 Barr 73 23 -- -- | | | | | 4 Chelf 81 10 66 23 | | | | |
| 6 Baldwin 54 46 46 54 | | | | | 8 Blitch 73 17 56 23 | | | | | 3 Brademas 94 6 -- -- | | | | | 2 Natcher 81 19 82 18 | | | | |
| 10 Gubser 65 17 58 28 | | | | | 10 Brown 90 10 78 22 | | | | | 8 Denton 79 4 79 19 | | | | | 7 Perkins 96 0 88 10 | | | | |
| 4 Mailiard 48 33 39 31 | | | | | 5 Davis 56 40 44 49 | | | | | 10 Harman 81 8 -- -- | | | | | 5 Spence 85 0 70 9 | | | | |
| 13 Teague 77* 9* 80 17 | | | | | 4 Flynt 50 40 36 50 | | | | | 9 Hogan 87 4 -- -- | | | | | 1 Stubblefield 92 6 -- -- | | | | |
| 28 Utt 94 2 82 8 | | | | | 3 Forrester 73 25 59 39 | | | | | 1 Madden 90 6 82 14 | | | | | 6 Watts 85 8 72 18 | | | | |
| 30 Wilson 79 8 54 19 | | | | | 9 Landrum 62 23 53 26 | | | | | 5 Roush 87 10 -- -- | | | | | 8 Siler 71 17 59 15 | | | | |
| 9 Younger 96 4 88 11 | | | | | 7 Mitchell 90 6 68 24 | | | | | 6 Wampler 92 4 -- -- | | | | | LOUISIANA | | | | |
| Los Angeles County | | | | | 2 Pilcher 79 10 68 19 | | | | | 4 Adair 75 15 74 17 | | | | | 2 Boggs 75 10 81 10 | | | | |
| 23 Doyle 100 0 63 6 | | | | | 1 Preston 62 10 46 9 | | | | | 7 Bray 67 27 55 36 | | | | | 4 Brooks 73 23 56 23 | | | | |
| 19 Holifield 77 4 79 14 | | | | | 6 Vinson 85 15 60 20 | | | | | 2 Halleck 85 8 67 21 | | | | | 1 Hebert 75 17 41 26 | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 8 McSween 58 33 -- -- | | | | |

Democrats in this type; *Republicans in Italics*

| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
|----------------------|-----|----|----|----|-----------------|-----|----|----|----|--------------|----|----|----|----|---------------|----|----|----|----|
| 6 Morrison | 56 | 8 | 54 | 5 | NEBRASKA | | | | | 7 Lennon | 67 | 27 | 48 | 38 | 6 McMillan | 60 | 29 | 53 | 39 |
| 5 Passman | 69 | 17 | 73 | 16 | 3 Brock | 69 | 29 | -- | -- | 5 Scott | 56 | 31 | 59 | 34 | 2 Riley | 67 | 25 | 61 | 30 |
| 7 Thompson | 52 | 12 | 49 | 15 | 4 McGinley | 67 | 25 | -- | -- | 11 Whitener | 67 | 27 | 55 | 38 | 1 Rivers | 77 | 12 | 54 | 25 |
| 3 Willis | 69 | 19 | 63 | 24 | 2 Cunningham | 87 | 12 | 72 | 26 | 10 Jonas | 92 | 8 | 81 | 17 | SOUTH DAKOTA | | | | |
| MAINE | | | | | 1 Weaver | 73 | 21 | 76 | 24 | NORTH DAKOTA | | | | | 1 McGovern | 90 | 4 | 83 | 11 |
| 2 Coffin | 75 | 17 | 79 | 9 | NEVADA | | | | | AL Burdick | 92 | 6 | -- | -- | 2 Berry | 87 | 12 | 76 | 21 |
| 1 Oliver | 98 | 2 | -- | -- | AL Baring | 71 | 8 | 71 | 10 | AL Short | 87 | 12 | -- | -- | TENNESSEE | | | | |
| 3 McIntire | 87 | 6 | 53 | 27 | NEW HAMPSHIRE | | | | | OHIO | | | | | 6 Bass | 87 | 6 | 73 | 21 |
| MARYLAND | | | | | 2 Bass | 81 | 15 | 69 | 20 | 9 Ashley | 71 | 23 | 66 | 26 | 9 Davis | 77 | 4 | 53 | 13 |
| 2 Brewster | 75 | 21 | -- | -- | 1 Merrow | 35 | 60 | 39 | 56 | 11 Cook | 75 | 17 | -- | -- | 8 Everett | 81 | 19 | 73 | 22 |
| 4 Fallon | 81 | 19 | 64 | 26 | NEW JERSEY | | | | | 20 Feighan | 77 | 19 | 71 | 24 | 4 Evins | 67 | 12 | 69 | 22 |
| 6 Foley | 92 | 4 | -- | -- | 11 Addonizio | 83 | 15 | 77 | 22 | 18 Hays | 73 | 8 | 55 | 22 | 3 Frazier | 83 | 8 | 72 | 24 |
| 7 Friedel | 92 | 6 | 64 | 10 | 14 Daniels | 87 | 12 | -- | -- | 19 Kirwan | 77 | 17 | 81 | 9 | 5 Loser | 62 | 10 | 55 | 28 |
| 3 Garmatz | 71 | 8 | 77 | 11 | 13 Gallagher | 88 | 12 | -- | -- | 17 Levering | 79 | 21 | -- | -- | 7 Murray | 46 | 50 | 42 | 43 |
| 1 Johnson | 58 | 17 | -- | -- | 10 Rodino | 77 | 15 | 75 | 22 | 10 Moeller | 58 | 21 | -- | -- | 2 Baker | 52 | 44 | 50 | 32 |
| 5 Lankford | 85 | 15 | 78 | 14 | 4 Thompson | 77 | 17 | 79 | 11 | 6 Vacancy | | | | | 1 Reece | 60 | 21 | 48 | 26 |
| MASSACHUSETTS | | | | | 3 Auchincloss | 87 | 8 | 63 | 29 | 21 Vanik | 81 | 19 | 67 | 21 | TEXAS | | | | |
| 2 Boland | 73 | 25 | 71 | 25 | 1 Cabill | 73 | 19 | -- | -- | 14 Ayres | 73 | 21 | 66 | 26 | 3 Beckworth | 90 | 10 | 84 | 16 |
| 13 Burke | 85 | 12 | -- | -- | 8 Canfield | 21 | 19 | 46 | 52 | 13 Baumhart | 60 | 12 | 60 | 15 | 2 Brooks | 94 | 6 | 84 | 16 |
| 4 Donohue | 79 | 12 | 74 | 14 | 6 Dwyer | 71 | 29 | 60 | 40 | 8 Betts | 83 | 12 | 94 | 5 | 17 Burleson | 65 | 35 | 65 | 35 |
| 7 Lane | 83 | 12 | 78 | 21 | 5 Frelinghuysen | 69 | 15 | 57 | 27 | 22 Bolton | 73 | 4 | 72 | 20 | 22 Casey | 50 | 29 | -- | -- |
| 8 Macdonald | 65 | 27 | 54 | 30 | 2 Glenn | 60 | 15 | 46 | 35 | 16 Bow | 87 | 4 | 74 | 17 | 7 Dowdy | 58 | 42 | 43 | 49 |
| 12 McCormack | 100 | 0 | 76 | 5 | 9 Osmers | 79 | 15 | 52 | 46 | 7 Brown | 92 | 6 | 85 | 15 | 21 Fisher | 65 | 27 | 61 | 36 |
| 11 O'Neill | 83 | 10 | 75 | 14 | 12 Wallbauer | 65 | 21 | -- | -- | 12 Devine | 96 | 2 | -- | -- | 13 Ikard | 87 | 10 | 76 | 22 |
| 3 Philbin | 75 | 12 | 75 | 14 | 7 Widnall | 77 | 17 | 56 | 38 | 15 Henderson | 92 | 6 | 85 | 6 | 20 Kilday | 83 | 15 | 77 | 20 |
| 6 Bates | 92 | 8 | 83 | 16 | NEW MEXICO | | | | | 2 Hess | 79 | 4 | 78 | 14 | 15 Kilgore | 69 | 31 | 59 | 40 |
| 1 Conte | 79 | 21 | -- | -- | AL Montoya | 85 | 4 | 73 | 8 | 5 Latta | 90 | 10 | -- | -- | 19 Mahon | 62 | 35 | 67 | 32 |
| 10 Curtis | 79 | 19 | 66 | 26 | AL Morris | 85 | 12 | -- | -- | 4 McCulloch | 90 | 10 | 88 | 3 | 1 Patman | 85 | 10 | 88 | 9 |
| 9 Keith | 90 | 8 | -- | -- | NEW YORK | | | | | 23 Minsball | 81 | 4 | 81 | 6 | 11 Poage | 60 | 17 | 73 | 22 |
| 14 Martin | 58 | 6 | 60 | 25 | 41 Dulski | 71 | 25 | -- | -- | 3 Schenck | 92 | 8 | 91 | 9 | 4 Rayburn | | | | |
| 5 Rogers | 40 | 50 | 41 | 50 | 30 O'Brien | 48 | 19 | 60 | 20 | 1 Scherer | 87 | 4 | 68 | 9 | 18 Rogers | 71 | 23 | 70 | 28 |
| MICHIGAN | | | | | 32 Stratton | 73 | 27 | -- | -- | OKLAHOMA | | | | | 16 Rutherford | 83 | 17 | 59 | 31 |
| 7 O'Hara | 90 | 10 | -- | -- | 27 Barry | 85 | 6 | -- | -- | 3 Albert | 90 | 2 | 84 | 9 | 6 Teague | 69 | 19 | 51 | 22 |
| 12 Bennett | 62 | 35 | 44 | 53 | 3 Becker | 87 | 0 | 80 | 6 | 2 Edmondson | 96 | 2 | 85 | 5 | 8 Thomas | 79 | 19 | 61 | 30 |
| 8 Bentley | 85 | 6 | 64 | 8 | 2 Derounian | 94 | 0 | 80 | 6 | 5 Jarman | 69 | 27 | 72 | 23 | 9 Thompson | 92 | 6 | 78 | 18 |
| 18 Broomfield | 87 | 12 | 69 | 28 | 26 Dooley | 67 | 27 | 60 | 23 | 6 Morris | 98 | 2 | 77 | 5 | 10 Thornberry | 85 | 15 | 73 | 17 |
| 10 Cederberg | 96 | 2 | 93 | 6 | 33 Kilburn | 69 | 2 | 52 | 5 | 4 Stead | 81 | 15 | 74 | 14 | 12 Wright | 77 | 15 | 83 | 17 |
| 6 Chamberlain | 90 | 10 | 78 | 19 | 40 Miller | 62 | 6 | 52 | 9 | 1 Belcher | 77 | 15 | 74 | 21 | 14 Young | 90 | 10 | 69 | 21 |
| 5 Ford | 77 | 0 | 78 | 21 | 39 Ostertag | 100 | 0 | 81 | 14 | OREGON | | | | | 5 Alger | 96 | 2 | 78 | 9 |
| 9 Griffin | 87 | 4 | 70 | 24 | 42 Pillion | 71 | 8 | 79 | 10 | 3 Green | 77 | 6 | 81 | 11 | UTAH | | | | |
| 4 Hoffman | 65 | 0 | 76 | 6 | 34 Pirnie | 81 | 15 | -- | -- | 4 Porter | 81 | 6 | 86 | 3 | 2 King | 83 | 17 | -- | -- |
| 3 Johansen | 94 | 2 | 90 | 9 | 43 Goodell | 79 | 7 | -- | -- | 2 Ullman | 98 | 2 | 93 | 5 | 1 Dixon | 83 | 10 | 70 | 30 |
| 11 Knox | 83 | 15 | 71 | 26 | 35 Rieblman | 85 | 6 | 70 | 20 | 1 Norblad | 62 | 25 | 67 | 22 | VERMONT | | | | |
| 2 Meader | 79 | 6 | 68 | 21 | 37 Robison | 94 | 4 | 86 | 14 | PENNSYLVANIA | | | | | AL Meyer | 90 | 10 | -- | -- |
| Detroit-Wayne County | | | | | 28 St. George | 73 | 2 | 78 | 9 | 25 Clark | 85 | 15 | 76 | 18 | VIRGINIA | | | | |
| 13 Diger | 69 | 6 | 52 | 14 | 36 Taber | 90 | 2 | 92 | 6 | 21 Dent | 77 | 10 | 84 | 14 | 4 Abbitt | 42 | 58 | 39 | 60 |
| 15 Dingell | 94 | 6 | 82 | 15 | 31 Taylor | 53 | 0 | 43 | 14 | 11 Flood | 85 | 15 | 82 | 11 | 1 Downing | 54 | 27 | -- | -- |
| 17 Griffiths | 81 | 17 | 83 | 15 | 1 Wainwright | 58 | 23 | 52 | 20 | 30 Holland | 90 | 2 | 84 | 5 | 3 Gary | 42 | 56 | 50 | 49 |
| 16 Lesinski | 73 | 12 | 74 | 11 | 38 Weis | 77 | 17 | -- | -- | 28 Moorhead | 94 | 4 | -- | -- | 2 Hardy | 71 | 25 | 60 | 35 |
| 1 Machrowicz | 69 | 10 | 70 | 9 | 29 Wharton | 98 | -- | 77 | 11 | 26 Morgan | 87 | 6 | 81 | 14 | 7 Harrison | 42 | 50 | 47 | 51 |
| 14 Rabaut | 60 | 12 | 90 | 10 | New York City | | | | | 10 Prokop | 98 | 2 | -- | -- | 9 Jennings | 90 | 8 | 72 | 24 |
| MINNESOTA | | | | | 8 Anuso | 62 | 0 | 58 | 3 | 19 Quigley | 83 | 15 | -- | -- | 8 Smith | 42 | 56 | 44 | 52 |
| 4 Blatnik | 94 | 2 | 77 | 13 | 24 Buckley | 56 | 0 | 29 | 2 | 14 Rhodes | 90 | 10 | 80 | 20 | 5 Tuck | 40 | 60 | 39 | 58 |
| 4 Karth | 92 | 8 | -- | -- | 11 Celler | 83 | 0 | 75 | 6 | 15 Walter | 69 | 12 | 52 | 17 | 10 Broyhill | 56 | 23 | 69 | 30 |
| 6 Marshall | 62 | 29 | 64 | 29 | 7 Delaney | 83 | 12 | 75 | 21 | 17 Bush | 85 | 4 | 67 | 19 | 6 Poff | 94 | 6 | 89 | 11 |
| 3 Wier | 92 | 8 | 78 | 20 | 23 Dollinger | 90 | 0 | 81 | 9 | 29 Corbett | 48 | 50 | 48 | 47 | WASHINGTON | | | | |
| 7 Andersen | 69 | 19 | 75 | 19 | 19 Farbstein | 81 | 4 | 75 | 10 | 8 Curtin | 62 | 31 | 70 | 28 | 7 Magnuson | 81 | 10 | 84 | 5 |
| 1 Quie | 83 | 15 | 71 | 29 | 22 Healey | 87 | 0 | 78 | 8 | 9 Dague | 85 | 4 | 82 | 10 | 5 Horan | 69 | 27 | 45 | 52 |
| 5 Judd | 77 | 21 | 55 | 42 | 6 Holtzman | 83 | 15 | 31 | 9 | 12 Fenton | 79 | 21 | 60 | 36 | 3 Mack | 79 | 12 | 73 | 22 |
| 9 Langen | 77 | 23 | -- | -- | 10 Kelly | 87 | 6 | 73 | 20 | 27 Fulton | 52 | 48 | 29 | 63 | 4 May | 71 | 19 | -- | -- |
| 2 Nelsen | 87 | 12 | -- | -- | 9 Keogh | 71 | 2 | 78 | 7 | 23 Gavin | 62 | 33 | 50 | 45 | 1 Pelly | 85 | 15 | 61 | 38 |
| MISSISSIPPI | | | | | 13 Multer | 90 | 0 | 80 | 7 | 24 Kearns | 48 | 29 | 44 | 41 | 6 Tollefson | 52 | 27 | 42 | 53 |
| 1 Abernethy | 65 | 33 | 59 | 40 | 16 Powell | 58 | 8 | 40 | 5 | 13 Lajore | 94 | 2 | 84 | 16 | 2 Westland | 69 | 10 | 65 | 25 |
| 6 Colmer | 52 | 40 | 40 | 35 | 14 Rooney | 81 | 15 | 85 | 14 | 7 Milliken | 94 | 6 | -- | -- | WEST VIRGINIA | | | | |
| 3 Smith | 77 | 12 | 79 | 20 | 18 Santangelo | 90 | 0 | 86 | 3 | 16 Mumma | 98 | 2 | 86 | 9 | 3 Bailey | 90 | 8 | 70 | 19 |
| 2 Whitten | 44 | 46 | 52 | 43 | 20 Teller | 79 | 0 | 79 | 5 | 22 Saylor | 69 | 29 | 49 | 40 | 4 Hechler | 77 | 23 | -- | -- |
| 4 Williams | 54 | 29 | 45 | 48 | 21 Zelenko | 81 | 4 | 71 | 7 | 18 Simpson | 79 | 4 | 74 | 6 | 5 Kee | 85 | 4 | 78 | 14 |
| 5 Winstead | 52 | 37 | 47 | 39 | 5 Bosch | 92 | 2 | 84 | 10 | 20 Van Zandt | 65 | 33 | 54 | 45 | 6 Slack | 87 | 6 | -- | -- |
| MISSOURI | | | | | 12 Dorn | 60 | 40 | 60 | 35 | Philadelphia | | | | | 2 Stagers | 90 | 4 | 72 | 18 |
| 5 Bolling | 79 | 0 | 84 | 7 | 25 Fino | 50 | 40 | 46 | 32 | 1 Barrett | 85 | 6 | 75 | 9 | 1 Moore | 50 | 42 | 63 | 34 |
| 7 Brown | 85 | 2 | 83 | 14 | 4 Halpern | 56 | 40 | -- | -- | 3 Byrne | 90 | 6 | 80 | 10 | WISCONSIN | | | | |
| 9 Cannon | 56 | 33 | 57 | 40 | 17 Lindsay | 69 | 31 | -- | -- | 2 Granahan | 85 | 4 | 80 | 11 | 1 Flynn | 92 | 8 | -- | -- |
| 8 Carnahan | 90 | 2 | 63 | 13 | 15 Ray | 100 | 0 | 90 | 10 | 5 Green | 81 | 6 | 59 | 11 | 9 Johnson | 96 | 4 | 74 | 23 |
| 4 Randall | 96 | 4 | -- | -- | NORTH CAROLINA | | | | | 4 Nix | 85 | 6 | 84 | 16 | 2 Kastenmeier | 90 | 10 | -- | -- |
| 6 Hull | 71 | 29 | 67 | 29 | 9 Alexander | 58 | 42 | 52 | 43 | 6 Toll | 92 | 2 | -- | -- | 5 Reuss | 94 | 6 | 76 | 24 |
| 10 Jones | 46 | 27 | 57 | 22 | 3 Barden | 35 | 29 | 34 | 30 | RHODE ISLAND | | | | | 4 Zablocki | 85 | 15 | 70 | 22 |
| 1 Karsten | 100 | 0 | 91 | 9 | 1 Bonner | 87 | 8 | 67 | 29 | 2 Fogarty | 54 | 19 | 60 | 20 | 8 Byrnes | 96 | 2 | 86 | 13 |
| 11 Moulder | 81 | 67 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Democrats in this type; Republicans in Italics

GROWING NUCLEAR HAZARDS IN THE ATOMIC AGE

World-wide fear of devastation from a nuclear war and of the mounting hazards of continued nuclear bomb testing has prompted President Eisenhower, Soviet Premier Khrushchev and other world leaders to try to thaw out the cold war. It also has brought nuclear weapons testing to a halt. All such tests have been suspended by the three nuclear powers, the United States, the United Kingdom and the Soviet Union since Nov. 3, 1958. The same concern about nuclear hazards prompted Congress, other national and international groups to try to learn more about radiation and how to control it.

Effects of Radiation

The harmful effects of radiation first came to national attention in the early 1920's when women who painted watch dials with radium developed cancer, bone tumors and anemia. Most of them have since died of radiation-induced diseases.

The horror of mass radiation damage came to world attention in 1945 when the United States dropped two atomic bombs on Hiroshima and Nagasaki, Japan, in an attempt to speed the end of World War II. The bombs, which contained 40,000 tons of deadly radioactive fission, killed 106,000 Japanese and injured 110,000 from the blast, burns and radiation. Deaths from the delayed effects of radiation also have occurred since then. Subsequent radioactive "dusting" of a group of Marshall Islanders and a Japanese fishing crew caused by the United States nuclear weapons tests in the South Pacific in 1954 led to a Japanese demand to end all nuclear testing. It also spurred an effort by United States scientists to reduce the fission content in nuclear bombs. Meanwhile, Britain began nuclear bomb tests in 1952, and France and Communist China were expected to carry on nuclear weapons tests to fulfill their desire to become nuclear powers.

Radiation-Induced Diseases

Radiation in its various forms is a cause of cancer, particularly of the bones, blood and lungs. Cells of the reproductive system, lymph glands and bone marrow are particularly sensitive to radiation. It is a cause of diseases to the eye, ear, and the digestive tract. It can render the body more susceptible to infection and disease by lowering the blood count, shorten the lifespan and cause sterility. By attacking the reproductive cells controlling heredity, it causes an increase in still births, deformities and abnormalities in future generations. Of particular concern is the belief that radiation can cause an increase in mental defects and lower physical vigor in unborn generations. From the standpoint of heredity, all radiation is harmful. Children and pregnant women are particularly sensitive to radiation.

Man has been living with radiation since the beginning of time, for there is natural radiation in the earth's atmosphere. It comes from cosmic rays and from such

radioactive elements as uranium and radium. The first man-made radiation came with the discovery of X-rays in 1895. Even with the inception of atomic power, X-rays today are still the major source of man-made radiation. It has been estimated that by the age of 30 a man has been exposed to about four rems from natural radiation and about 5 rems from X-rays and other forms of medical radiation. All other types of radiation, including the world-wide fallout from atomic weapons testing, accounts for less than one rem. In 1959 it was believed that radiation exposure should not be more than 10 rems as the average per capita dose at the age of 30.

The amount of radiation from man-made causes will increase in future years with the expansion of the atomic energy industry, the use of atomic-propelled ships, submarines, and airplanes, and the increased use of radioactive isotopes by farmers, industry and doctors. Increasing numbers of people will be employed in industries in which they will be exposed to radiation. Therefore, the Federal Government is stepping up its research in detecting and measuring radiation and efforts are being carried on, notably by the U.S. Public Health Service, to cut back on the unnecessary use of X-rays. Many states now ban the use of fluoroscopes to fit shoes.

The increased hazards from radiation which came with the atomic age are not unusual. The automobile age also added a new hazard to life in traffic deaths and accidents. But no one seriously considers returning to the age of the horse-and-buggy, because the benefits of mass transportation by auto greatly outweigh its hazards. So it will be with atomic energy. The aim is to minimize nuclear hazards while getting maximum value out of this unlimited new source of energy.

Extent of Risk

There is a wide divergence of opinion as to the extent of the risk from radiation. The maximum dosage rates for workers in the atomic energy program and other workers consistently exposed to radiation has been sharply scaled down in recent years. The National Advisory Committee on Radiation reported to the U.S. Surgeon General in March that, because of lack of much basic scientific data, it was currently very difficult, if not impossible, to establish "many radiation protection standards on a wholly satisfactory basis." There had been no clear federal policy as to the role of the various federal departments and agencies in defining, controlling and enforcing radiation safety programs. The role of the states also was unclear.

In an attempt to meet this problem, the President issued an executive order on Aug. 14 establishing a Federal Radiation Council. Members are the Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare, who was appointed chairman of the Council, and the Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Commerce. The President gave the Department

of Health, Education and Welfare the primary responsibility to collect, analyze and interpret data on radiation relating to public health and safety.

Congress Sept. 11 passed a bill (S 2568) establishing the Council as a statutory body, increasing its membership to include the Secretary of Labor and directing the Council to consult qualified scientists and experts on radiation matters. It also permitted the states to assume increased responsibility and control over radiation hazards, and authorized the Atomic Energy Commission to assist the states, particularly by training state personnel, to assume their new responsibilities. (Weekly Report p. 1286)

War and Fallout

Nuclear hazards became a burning world issue because of the widespread destruction that could be caused to all living organisms, including man, by an all-out nuclear war. Although it is not believed by most experts that an all-out nuclear war would annihilate the human race, it is believed that such a holocaust would kill many millions of people in the nation or nations under all-out attack and would virtually immobilize the great cities.

The scope of a nuclear attack has been considered by many groups. In 1959 a comprehensive study of the problem was done by the Special Subcommittee on Radiation of the Joint Atomic Energy Committee. The hearings held June 22-26 were under the chairmanship of Rep. Chet Holifield (D Calif.). The Subcommittee assumed for study purposes that 4,000 megaton bombs were dropped on the world in one day. It assumed that the United States was attacked in mid-October, after the harvest of the most important farm crops, by an enemy dropping 263 nuclear bombs, with a total yield of 1,446 megatons, on 224 U.S. cities and military bases located in every state of the Union. It also assumed that an additional 2,500 megatons were dropped elsewhere in the Northern Hemisphere on U.S. overseas bases and by the United States in retaliation against the homeland of the aggressor nation. It assumed the energy yield of the bombs was 50 percent fusion and 50 percent fission. Fission is the primary source of radioactive fallout. Fallout occurs when a nuclear bomb is exploded and throws high into the air a huge cloud of radioactive particles which gradually descend back to earth in different sizes and at different rates.

On the basis of such a hypothetical attack, the expert testimony presented at the Joint Committee hearings indicated that such an attack would cost the lives of about 25 percent of the U.S. population; that nearly 50 million Americans would be killed, including nearly 23 million the first day. The experts also believed that 20 million more would sustain serious though non-fatal injuries. They thought that the blast and the intense concentration of heat and radiation from the bombs' fire balls would account for 75 percent of the deaths. They estimated that fallout would account for 25 percent of the deaths and more than half of the injuries.

On the basis of the Subcommittee's assumed attack, the experts also estimated that:

1. Nearly 50 percent or approximately 35 million dwellings in the United States would be destroyed or unusable for a period of several months because of radiation.
2. Millions of animals used as a source of food would be killed, mainly by fallout.
3. Destruction to growing crops and damage to food would be widespread, but the harvested crops would not be as contaminated by fallout as the crops not yet harvested.

4. Maximum fallout would not occur at the point of the bomb strike, but at points up to 60-70 miles distant.

5. Fallout would occur over the rest of the world, but it would not pose a major survival problem. The nuclear war would, however, raise the level of strontium 90 to more than the maximum permissible concentration recommended for the population as a whole as a peacetime standard.

6. The experts were not able to assess the long-term effects of such a hypothetical nuclear war, but they said it would "greatly increase" genetic mutations -- i.e., abnormalities and stillbirths in succeeding generations.

As much of the fallout would occur outside of the major industrial centers and military installations which would be the targets of the direct hits, experts estimated that the fallout hazard could be greatly minimized by an effective national civil defense program. They estimated that such a program could reduce total fatalities from 25 percent to about three percent of the U.S. population. The main conclusion of the evidence presented at the hearings, the Committee said, was that the nation must have a national civil defense system "if the nation is to withstand and recover from an attack of the scale which is possible in an all-out nuclear war." Similar conclusions on the importance of civilian defense to reduce deaths and injuries in a nuclear war were repeatedly emphasized by the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization, the Rockefeller Survival Report presented by Gov. Nelson Rockefeller (R N.Y.) to his state on July 7, and Sen. Hubert H. Humphrey (D Minn.). Humphrey Aug. 24 announced that a comprehensive civil defense manual had been printed at his request by the Senate Government Operations Committee. It was estimated that a national civil defense program would cost from \$5 billion to \$20 billion. The Radiation Subcommittee Aug. 31 published a summary of its hearings, "Biological and Environmental Effects of Nuclear War."

Fallout Controversy

Of all the nuclear hazards, nuclear fallout is the most controversial. Distinguished scientists, and many other experts, differ greatly as to the nature of fallout, its extent and effect on living organisms. Chairman Clinton P. Anderson (D N.M.) of the Joint Atomic Energy Committee complained June 13 that his Committee's effort "to obtain full information on the fallout problem has been plagued by confusion among scientists" who had offered the Committee both "technical advice and political judgment."

For example, the AEC General Advisory Committee on May 4 said the fallout hazard from all bomb explosions and nuclear weapons testing to date was less than 5 percent as much as the average exposure to cosmic rays and other natural radiation and less than 5 percent of the estimated average radiation exposure of the American public to X-rays for medical purposes. Dr. Charles L. Dunham, director of the AEC Division of Biology and Medicine, told the Joint Committee May 5 that the fallout from nuclear weapons to date might account for an additional 500 deaths and diseases to present and future generations as an annual average including from 3,500 to 7,000 additional bone cancer cases in the next 70 years. But he told the Society of Nuclear Medicine on June 19 that he believed these estimates were high. Dr. Linus

Pauling, a Nobel prize-winning scientist of California Institute of Technology, March 30 predicted fallout to date would cause cancer or other serious disease in 50,000 Americans and 23,000 mental defects in future generations.

Hearings on Fallout

The Joint Committee's Radiation Subcommittee under Chairman Holifield has held hearings on fallout twice during the past two and a half years, in May and June of 1957, and also May 5-8, 1959. The hearings developed significant differences, mainly because more was known about fallout in 1959 than two years earlier. One of the most interesting changes in scientific thinking concerns the rate of fallout. In 1957 the general consensus was that it took radioactive material from five to ten years to fall out of the atmosphere to earth. In 1959 the general consensus was that the radioactive debris was returning to earth in from one to five years. The faster fallout would make the shorter-lived isotopes, or radioactive elements, a greater potential health hazard than previously believed.

The fallout hearings in 1959 also had new information on fission yield. AEC estimated that to date the three nuclear powers, the United States, the United Kingdom and the Soviet Union, had detonated nuclear weapons with a total energy yield of 170 megatons, of which 90-92 megatons was fission yield. AEC also estimated that about 40 megatons of fission were detonated in 1957-58. The AEC's estimates were as follows:

FISSION YIELD FROM NUCLEAR BLASTS - 1945-58
(In megatons)

| Inclusive Years | US-UK | USSR* |
|-----------------|-------|-------|
| 1945-51 | .7 | .06 |
| 1952-54 | 37. | .5 |
| 1955-56 | 9.2 | 4. |
| 1957-58 | 19. | 21. |
| Total | 65.9 | 25.56 |

*Fission estimated at 50 percent of total energy yield.

The Committee said the "predicted average concentration" of strontium 90 in the human bone would be "about 48 strontium units" if nuclear testing followed the same pattern in the next 40 years as it had for the past five years. "This is close enough to the maximum permissible body burden of 67 strontium units recommended by the International Commission on Radiological Protection to suggest that a hazard to the world's population could result" from fallout if nuclear bomb tests were continued for the next two generations, the Committee said.

Other major points brought out by the hearings were that:

1. Strontium 90 and cesium 137, both long-lived radioactive elements, are still considered the greatest hazards in world-wide fallout, but carbon 14, an even longer-lived radioactive element, appears to be a greater long-range hazard than was previously believed. Strontium 90 is a cause of leukemia, bone tumors and cancers; cesium 137 concentrates in the muscles and flesh and destroys reproductive cells, and carbon 14 can cause abnormalities and stillbirths in future generations.

2. Fallout is not uniform. About two-thirds of the fallout to date has occurred in the Northern Hemisphere, one-third in the Southern Hemisphere. Fallout also tends

Atomic Terms

Atom -- The smallest particle of a chemical element.

Fission -- Splitting the inner core of uranium or plutonium atoms into two parts to generate energy. Fission releases intense heat and harmful radiation.

Fusion -- The joining of the cores of atoms to form a heavier atomic nucleus. Fusion is accomplished under conditions of extreme heat and by the release of a vast amount of energy. The energy of the sun comes from the fusion of hydrogen atoms to form helium.

Isotope -- Related atomic nuclei of the same element. They have the same energy charge and identical chemical behavior but have small differences in atomic weight. Uranium 235 and uranium 238 are isotopes of the same element.

Megaton -- One million tons. A one megaton nuclear bomb has the explosive energy equivalent of one million tons of TNT.

Radiation -- The release of atomic energy which damages many substances, including cells, tissues and body fluids of all living creatures. Severe radiation causes death. Unstable atoms which have a spontaneous nuclear charge, then disintegrate or decay, are said to be radioactive.

Rem -- A unit measuring a dose of exposure to all types of radiation in relation to its biological effect on man.

Curie -- A measure of the rate that a radioactive material throws off particles.

Strontium 90 -- Generally regarded as the most destructive long-lived radioactive isotope. Like calcium, strontium 90 lodges in the bone. But calcium is a bone builder; strontium 90 destroys bone cells, is a cause of cancer of the bone and of the blood.

to be heavier in the 40-50 degree latitudes in both hemispheres than at the Equator. The United States generally has received more fallout than any other nation because of the Nevada Testing Site and the prevailing west-to-east winds. Fallout rates are affected by seasonal fluctuations, air currents and weather. For example, strontium 90 falls out faster in the spring and summer than in the fall and winter.

3. Large doses of radioactive fallout appear to have more adverse effects on living creatures and their descendants than small doses of the same amount absorbed over a long period of time.

4. Certain plants and crops, notably wheat, rice, various grasses and vegetables, appear to pick up more fallout from rain falling directly on their leaves than through the soil. They also pick up fallout from the soil. Cows, on the other hand, absorb most of the fallout from the food and water which they eat and drink, so only a small quantity of radioactivity is passed on in dairy products. Thus, assuming an equal amount of fallout on the Eastern and Western hemispheres, Eastern people subsisting largely on a cereal diet, would receive twice as much strontium 90 through their food as Western people whose diet contains a larger proportion of dairy products.

5. The average concentration of strontium 90 in human bone from past nuclear tests will increase, as it did during 1957 and 1958, until 1965, even if no more nuclear tests are conducted. However, this concentration

is not considered harmful. Nor are the temporary higher-than-average concentrations of fallout considered hazardous to the populations of "hot spots." Heavy rains from clouds containing a relatively high concentration of radioactive material have caused such "hot spots" in recent years in St. Louis, North Dakota, Minnesota, upstate New York, and elsewhere. A summary of the hearings, "Fall-out from Nuclear Weapons Tests," was published Aug. 24.

Workmen's Compensation

The growth of the commercial use of atomic energy in this country will result in an ever-increasing number of reaction disabilities to workers. Most radiation diseases and injuries were not covered in 1959 by workmen's compensation laws. Moreover, the unusual problems posed by radiation damage will require major changes in such laws. Workmen's compensation legislation is generally based on compensating workers for obvious or readily diagnosed diseases and injuries arising out of or in the course of their employment.

Hearings by the Joint Atomic Energy Committee March 10-12, 17-18 raised many difficult problems and questions about adequately compensating workers for radiation damage. Among them were the following:

- Effects of radiation damage often do not show up until many years after the damage was first suffered, so it is difficult to establish a causal relationship between the damage and the occupational exposure.

- Because radiation damage is cumulative, it is difficult to determine which employer should be held responsible for the disability and to fix a statute of limitations on it.

- Overexposure to radiation can cause a shortening of the lifespan, sterility and damage to a workers' reproductive organs which may result in mutations, or deformities, in his descendants. Are these legally compensable injuries which can be or should be covered by workmen's compensation laws?

The hearings pointed up two other related monumental problems. The first is that there is not enough scientific and medical knowledge about radiation yet to establish adequate standards. The second is that most states have so little knowledge about radiation hazards that it is difficult for them to amend their workmen's compensation laws. A number of witnesses, particularly those representing organized labor, felt, therefore, that federal legislation was necessary to insure adequate coverage and uniform treatment for workers suffering from radiation damage. The Committee did not recommend over-all federal legislation in a September summary of its hearings. But it did suggest 10 courses of federal action to prompt states to meet the problem of compensating for radiation damage. Among them were withholding federal contracts from firms in states without adequate coverage; establishing recommended standards for compensation laws, and providing grants-in-aid and other federal inducements to get states to meet these standards.

The Joint Committee concluded that compensation laws should include these minimum provisions: classification of radiation injuries and diseases as compensable; setting a time limit for filing claims predicated on the fact that disability for radiation exposure might not occur until long after the original exposure; coverage should include complete medical treatment and rehabilitation; benefits should be paid on basis of loss of earnings or of earning capacity; standards can and must be provided

by which the causal relationship between exposure and subsequent disability can be established. The Committee also stated that regulations covering radiation damage must be strengthened "whether it be through the federal or state level" and should be enforced as a part of the workmen's compensation system.

Indemnity

Congress in 1957 enacted legislation permitting the Government to provide indemnities up to \$500 million for damages resulting from nuclear accidents in private industry. In the event a nuclear reactor or power plant should "run away," the cost to the employer would be very great. No such accident happened by 1959, but Chairman Clinton P. Anderson (D N.M.) of the Joint Atomic Energy Committee predicted in September that "ten years from now we probably will have encountered our first major accident." Therefore, the Government has required all AEC licensees to take out and maintain financial protection against such accidents. The Government itself would meet up to a maximum of \$500 million to settle damage claims resulting from a single nuclear accident. (1957 Almanac p. 587)

Actually AEC and its contractors have maintained a superior safety record. For the 14-year period 1945-58, there were 5,651 injuries from all causes in AEC installations run by contractors, but only 35 were caused by radiation. During the same period, there were 202 fatalities, but only four were due to radiation. The basic safe working dose for workers in AEC installations is set at three rems a quarter, and from 5-12 rems a year, depending on the age of a worker. Complete records of exposure are kept on each worker. If a dose of radiation totaling 25 rems is experienced by a worker, he is not allowed further exposure and is transferred to other work. No injury from radiation has ever been suffered at the AEC headquarters. Yet in the fiscal year 1954, there were 34 falls at the headquarters.

Radioactive Waste Disposal

The United States in 1959 had 65 million gallons of highly radioactive waste from atomic plants in storage, and it was disposing of nine billion gallons of low-level waste annually under its atomic energy program, according to testimony presented to the Joint Atomic Energy Committee in 1959. It was estimated that the nation might accumulate up to 1 billion gallons of highly radioactive waste by the year 2000. Both the Joint Committee and the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee held hearings on this growing problem in 1959. In a summary of its hearings issued Sept. 3, the Joint Committee said that to date the disposal of radioactive waste had "not resulted in any harmful effect on the public." Its hearings were held Jan. 28-30, Feb. 2-3 and July 29.

But it said that the question of final disposal of highly radioactive waste, which contains up to thousands of curies of radiation per gallon, had not been solved. Most of this waste was buried near AEC installations at Oak Ridge, Tenn., Idaho Falls, Idaho, Los Alamos, N.M., the Savannah River Plant, S.C., and the Hanford plant at Richland, Wash. It is stored in heavy steel tanks. Studies were being made particularly at Oak Ridge to try to remove isotopes from some of this high-level waste. Studies were also being made on methods to convert liquid waste into solids and store it in underground salt beds, or to pump it under-

Nuclear Hazards - 5

ground and mix it with concrete to store it in salt, shale or sandstone formations. Because they are dry and non-permeable, salt beds appeared to the Joint Committee to offer the best promise for storing highly radioactive waste.

Most low-level waste, which contains not more than one millionth of a millionth of a curie per gallon, has been dispersed through the air, ground and water. At Hanford and Oak Ridge, low-level waste has been percolated into the ground, which is supposed to absorb all the radioactivity before it reaches underground water tables. Crops of barley grown for the past seven years experimentally at Hanford have been irrigated with water containing low-level radioactive waste, without any significant effect, the Joint Committee reported. Nevertheless, constant monitoring is necessary to see that neither type of radioactive waste pollutes surface or underground water supplies or gets into plants or crops.

Disposal at Sea

The great oceans of the world seem to some to be the most likely place to dispose of highly radioactive waste, but AEC did not, as of 1959, contemplate such disposal. It disposed of a limited amount of low-level waste in both the Atlantic and Pacific oceans in depths of not less than 1,000 fathoms at sea, and not less than 70 miles offshore. The National Academy of Sciences issued a committee report July 13 stating that all nuclear powered ships should discharge their radioactive waste at least 100 miles from shore. The United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea meeting in Geneva from February-April, 1958, unanimously adopted a resolution strongly opposed to "pollution of the seas or air space above (the seas)...with radioactive materials."

The AEC was subjected to a great amount of criticism from the state of Texas, state fishing, sportsmen's and conservation groups, and the cities of Houston and Galveston for failing to deny an application of a Houston firm filed in January 1958 to dispose of low-level prepackaged radioactive wastes in the deep water of the Gulf of Mexico about 180 miles south of Galveston. An AEC examiner on May 29 recommended that the license be issued. The AEC held a final hearing on the case Oct. 13. Like the UN group, the Texans were concerned that the radioactive waste would contaminate sea food, restrict sport fishing and other water sports. Many studies are now being conducted to determine the effect of radioactive waste on marine life, but little is known for certain at this time. The question of the burden of proof in the Texas case was hotly disputed. AEC claimed it rested with those who opposed the application. But the protesting Texans claimed the burden of proof rested with the applicant and the AEC.

Meanwhile, Rep. Clark W. Thompson (D Texas) on July 13 introduced a bill (HR 8187) to prohibit the disposal of any radioactive waste in the Gulf of Mexico less than 200 miles offshore, or less than 1,000 fathoms deep, or where the waters of the Gulf are customarily used for commercial or sports fishing. It also required the permission of a state to dump radioactive waste off its coast into the Gulf.

Uranium Mines

The most potentially dangerous industrial hazard in the atomic energy program appears to be uranium mining. Repeated surveys by the U.S. Public Health Service

indicate that about 65 percent of the uranium miners in underground uranium mines in the Colorado Plateau area (Colorado, Utah, New Mexico and Arizona) have been exposed to concentrations of radon gas and its products in excess of allowable limits. Radon is a radioactive gas. Since 1950, the Health Service, the states, the National Cancer Institute and the AEC have been examining Colorado Plateau uranium miners once every two years. Some 3,200 miners have been or are now in the survey group. Of the 50 miners in the original 1950 study, 16 are now dead. Four deaths have occurred from lung cancer during the past three years.

Dr. Harold J. Magnuson, chief of the Health Service's Occupational Health Branch, told Congressional Quarterly that "undoubtedly" some Colorado Plateau miners will die of lung cancer due to overexposure to radon gas. But he said it would take 15-20 years to obtain definite information. There are about 4,500 uranium miners in this country, of whom 4,000 work in Colorado Plateau mines. About 1,500 work in 300 Colorado Plateau mines which have little or no safeguards against radon. Except on mines located on Indian reservations, the states have complete jurisdiction over inspection and enforcement of safety standards in these mines. In uranium mines on Indian reservations, the U.S. Bureau of Mines is in charge of inspection, the U.S. Geological Survey is in charge of enforcement of safety standards.

Uranium Mills

The 25 uranium mills situated in the West, generally speaking, do not pose a significant radiation health hazard to their 5,000 employees. But by discharging radioactive waste into streams, they have caused a long-range health hazard to the general population. Since 1950, the Public Health Service, AEC and state health agencies have taken samples from streams into which uranium mills have discharged their radioactive wastes. The state of New Mexico in April 1958 asked the Health Service to conduct a detailed survey of the Animas river in Northwestern New Mexico. The study was completed in April 1959. It indicated that 30,000 persons in Southwestern Colorado and Northwestern New Mexico living below the Vanadium Corporation of America uranium mill at Durango, Colo., were using Animas river water which ranged from 40-160 percent above maximum permissible levels of radioactive content. Most of the contamination in the Animas was traced to radium discharged by the Durango VCA mill. As a result of the Animas survey, VCA entered into an agreement with Public Health Service on June 24 to "take immediate steps" to reduce radium in its waste discharge in the Animas river to a minimum by Oct. 24. This was the first federal enforcement action ever taken to control radioactive contamination on an interstate stream.

AEC announced on July 30 that uranium mills must reduce radioactive waste in their milling operations to a minimum or forfeit their AEC licenses to operate. Health Service announced Aug. 29 that it planned to sample all streams and underground water supplies below uranium mills. Anderson announced Sept. 20 that the Health Service would also begin by the end of the year a long-range study of the effects of low-level radiation on the general population of the San Juan Basin in Northwestern New Mexico and Southwestern Colorado. The service would use the Animas river study as the foundation for its planned long-range study.

CONGRESS TAKES NEW LOOK AT CIVIL DEFENSE

Civilian defense, long the stepchild of Government programs, is getting a new look from both Federal and state officials as a potential major factor in a nuclear war.

After huge hydrogen bombs were developed in 1952, many scientists saw little chance for human survival in the event of an all-out nuclear attack. But detailed studies in recent years by government and private organizations have indicated the lives of many millions of Americans could be saved, even under the most extreme conditions, if the Nation had an effective civilian defense program.

June hearings by the Joint Atomic Energy Committee Special Radiation Subcommittee brought testimony from leading radiation experts that the effects of a nuclear attack could be blunted by civilian preparedness. The Subcommittee assumed for study purposes that the United States was attacked in mid-October by an enemy dropping 1,446 megatons of atomic explosives. (A one-megaton nuclear bomb has the explosive energy of one million tons of dynamite.) Testimony indicated that such an attack would cost the lives of 50 million Americans and that 20 million more would sustain serious, though non-fatal, injuries. (See p. 1398)

The testimony revealed that the blast, and the intense heat and radiation from the fire balls of the bombs, would account for 75 percent of the deaths. But it also disclosed that fallout would account for the remaining 25 percent of the deaths and more than half of the injuries. (Fallout occurs when a nuclear bomb is exploded and throws high into the air a huge cloud of radioactive particles which gradually descend to earth in different sizes and at different rates.) The testimony revealed that fallout usually was more deadly in areas up to 75 miles from the target than at the point where the bomb hit, and that adequate shielding could materially reduce fallout deaths and injuries. (Weekly Report p. 863, 903)

Survival Measures

The Subcommittee, in an Aug. 31 report ("Biological and Environmental Effects of Nuclear War") on its June 22-26 hearings, concluded: "Probably the most significant finding presented...was that civil defense preparedness could reduce the (fallout) casualties of the assumed attack on the United States from approximately 30 percent of the population to about 3 percent. The provision of shielding against radiation effects would at the same time protect against blast and thermal effects for the vast majority of the population." The cost of providing high-performance shelter protection for 200 million people was estimated at between \$5 billion and \$20 billion.

"The main conclusion presented to the Subcommittee was that the country must have a national radiological defense system if the Nation is to withstand and recover from an attack of the scale which is possible in an all-out nuclear war," the report said.

The House Government Operations Military Operations Subcommittee, in hearings held from 1956-58, came to a similar conclusion. It repeatedly urged the construction of a nationwide system of shelters to shield the

population from blast, heat and radioactive fallout in the event of atomic attack.

Rep. Chet Holifield (D Calif.), chairman of both Subcommittees, participated in hearings on various phases of civilian defense annually since 1955. He told the House Aug. 27: "I have been shocked and appalled by our failure -- or I should say, our refusal -- to do anything to protect our people from the devastating effects of nuclear weapons in the event this Nation is attacked. The Executive Branch has refused to develop an effective national program for the protection of our people, and the Congress has not been willing to appropriate large funds for civil defense in the absence of a realistic executive plan."

Holifield said it was "a tragedy" that "the people of America now stand unshielded from the horrifying effects of a possible nuclear attack."

Rockefeller Task Force

Gov. Nelson A. Rockefeller (R N.Y.) and Sen. Hubert H. Humphrey (D Minn.), both Presidential hopefuls, have recently exhibited a great deal of interest in civilian defense problems.

After he was elected Governor in 1958, Rockefeller appointed a special task force to study the problem of protection from radioactive fallout. It concluded its study July 6 "with the conviction that a very high degree of protection from fallout can be achieved...at a cost within the reach of our people and our state. We are satisfied that, although thermonuclear war would be a major disaster, the magnitude of the disaster can be markedly limited by protective measures." With proper shielding, the report stated, "a tremendous number of casualties from fallout is avoidable."

The task force recommended that New York State enact laws (1) requiring all new construction within the state to provide shielding from fallout up to a minimum specified standard; (2) requiring owners of all existing buildings, by a specified future date, either to modify them or otherwise to provide fallout protection for their occupants; and (3) exempting from local real estate taxes improvements made to provide fallout protection.

It also recommended that the Governor initiate a state program to develop a "survival kit" enabling persons in shelters to survive in their protected area for at least two weeks without any outside assistance; and that he work with the Federal Government to develop an effective monitoring system for the detection of radiation.

In the wake of the task force report, Rockefeller reorganized the New York State Defense Council and announced July 31 the creation of a new committee to develop an economical shelter program. At the 51st Governors' Conference in San Juan, Puerto Rico, Aug. 2-5, Rockefeller presented the report of a special Civil Defense Committee, which he headed, laying out a civilian defense fallout protection program. The report was adopted unanimously. A special meeting of the Governors' Conference Civil Defense Committee, with Rockefeller as

chairman, was scheduled for Oct. 19 in Chicago in an attempt to stimulate more state action on civil defense. (Weekly Report p. 1098)

Humphrey Manual

At the request of Humphrey, the Senate Government Operations Committee Aug. 19 printed the first comprehensive Federal manual on disaster relief. It was designed for instant reference by city, county and state officials confronted by such natural disasters as fire, flood, or earthquake. It also would be a handy reference guide in the event of nuclear attack. Humphrey Aug. 31 told the Senate that 25 million Americans could be saved in the event of a medium-sized nuclear attack if the Federal Government took the lead in providing for a nationwide shelter and fallout-protection training program. Without such a program, at least 50 million Americans would die, mostly of radiation, he said. Humphrey noted the Federal Government "does not itself require that its own public buildings or Federally assisted construction be equipped with shelters. Incredible as it is, after 10 years of planning and study, there is still not even the beginning of a shelter program which could protect millions of Americans beyond the blast area from the nuclear explosion, and which could assure that the Nation would be able to pick itself off its feet and restore at least vital services within a reasonably short time," he said.

Responsibilities and Funds

The Nation's postwar civilian defense program, according to the Holifield Subcommittee, was plagued with two problems: divided responsibility and lack of funds. Congress itself was reluctant to meet Administration requests for funds because Federal civilian defense authorities had been uncertain about the type of program, according to Rep. Albert Thomas (D Texas), chairman of the House Appropriations Independent Offices Subcommittee. Thomas Sept. 13 said, "A shelter program was first proposed in 1950 when \$60 million was requested but refused as an initial appropriation. Since then the civilian defense program has taken a complete turn. The shelter program was abandoned in favor of one emphasizing evacuation of possible target areas. During the past 12 months shelters have been urged again."

Building a Home Shelter

Experts believe most human beings can survive a nuclear attack if they are not in the immediate area of the bomb strike. But an individual's chance of survival depends largely on his own efforts.

Under the present civilian defense program, each individual is left personally responsible for his own survival in the initial chaotic days following a nuclear attack. Each family must be prepared to exist in an enclosed area for a minimum of two weeks following such an attack, without expecting any outside help, because of the danger from deadly radioactive fallout.

The Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization recommends the construction of an underground shelter in every home. It can be constructed for as little as \$150. A pamphlet detailing how to build a home shelter can be obtained from OCDM, Washington 25, D.C.

As usual, civilian defense funds were cut by Congress in 1959. Differences over civilian defense appropriations kept the fiscal 1960 Independent Offices appropriations bill (HR 7040) in conference for weeks. The House cut, and the Senate restored, \$15 million of the \$25 million requested by the President. The cut involved \$12 million to help the states and local governments pay for personnel and administrative costs and \$3 million to help the states provide civil defense training and equipment. The Senate Sept. 4 finally gave up the battle for the funds after the House Aug. 14 by a 241-167 roll call agreed to a motion by Thomas to insist on the reduction. The House Appropriations Committee characterized the disputed budget requests as a waste of public money to provide about 4,000 new "city hall jobs." Sen. Stephen Young (D Ohio) called the civilian defense program "childish." (Weekly Report p. 1120, 1250)

President Eisenhower Aug. 25 urgently requested the approval of a \$9 million supplemental appropriation to finance civil defense activities assigned to several Federal agencies. This request was chopped down to \$3,250,000 in the final appropriation bill (HR 8385). (Weekly Report p. 1226, 1283)

The cost of civilian defense in the nuclear age has appeared to be so high, and the problems of developing an effective program so complex, that no government agency at any level has been eager to assume either the responsibility or the cost. The Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950 (PL 81-920) vested the responsibility to protect life and property primarily with the states, counties and communities. The Federal Government was made responsible solely for coordination and guidance. (1950 Almanac p. 458) The law was amended in 1958 (PL 85-606) to vest responsibility jointly in the Federal Government, the states and state political subdivisions. The Federal Government also was authorized to bear half the cost of personnel, training and equipment, up to specified limits, until June 30, 1964. (1958 Almanac p. 205)

Defense as a Deterrent

Reports by the President's special study group known as the Gaither Committee, by the Rand Corp., and by the 1958 Rockefeller special studies project indicated that civilian and military defense were complementary. The thesis was that an unprepared Nation was more vulnerable to attack, more likely to be "blackmailed" into acquiescence by an aggressor; that civilian unpreparedness could actually affect the balance of military power. Conversely, it was held that a strong civilian defense program was a deterrent to war -- it made the cost of an attack inordinately high for the aggressor nation.

Testimony before the Special Radiation Subcommittee in June indicated that the United States was more vulnerable to nuclear attack than the Soviet Union because its industry was centralized in the Northeast, its population was largely urban and it was almost totally unprepared in civilian defense. The Soviet Union, it was revealed, had embarked on a comprehensive civilian defense program.

The Subcommittee stated in its August report: "This lack (of a U.S. civilian defense program) can prove very dangerous for the success of American and Western policy against Communist aggression.... The total unreadiness of the American people to survive a nuclear war -- which is well known both to the Russians and to our allies -- can greatly undermine our capability to resist possible Soviet nuclear blackmail."

PROPOSED TAX RULES ALARM TRADE ORGANIZATIONS

Proposed tax regulations regarding lobbying worry the hundreds of trade organizations supported by dues which are tax deductible.

The regulations also worry the business community itself. It fears the proposed tax rulings will make it more costly to defend itself through public relations campaigns.

Background

The Internal Revenue Service, the tax arm of the Treasury Department, periodically publishes regulations interpreting tax laws passed by Congress.

These regulations are designed to guide the taxpayers and Internal Revenue Service officers who go over the income tax forms. The regulations are not law, but interpretations of the law.

A taxpayer disallowed a deduction by the Internal Revenue Service, can go to court to claim that his deduction was justified under the regulations. Or he can argue that the Internal Revenue Service regulations misinterpret the law.

In 1919, the Internal Revenue Service published the regulation now in effect regarding lobbying. The 1919 regulation at first applied only to corporate income. But since 1938 the same regulation has applied to individual income. The regulation reads: "Sums of money expended for lobbying purposes, the promotion or defeat of legislation, the exploitation of propaganda, including advertising other than trade advertising, and contributions for campaign expenses, are not deductible from gross income."

The Supreme Court Feb. 24, 1959 upheld an IRS ruling that this regulation forbade tax deductions for expenses in lobbying against legislation or state referenda considered harmful to business.

The Internal Revenue Service Sept. 19, 1959 published proposed regulations regarding the tax deductions allowed for lobbying and trade organizations. The regulations largely are an explanation of how the Internal Revenue Service interprets its 1919 regulation. The proposed regulations would supersede regulations proposed July 10, 1956 but never adopted.

Protests

The Internal Revenue Service set Oct. 19 as the deadline for filing views on the proposed regulations. After Oct. 19, IRS scheduled a hearing.

Currently, firms deduct from their gross incomes dues paid to such trade organizations as the Chamber of Commerce of the U.S. Since the firms must pay a 52 percent corporate tax on their net income, such deductions lower the tax they pay. For example, if a company contributed \$1,000 to the Chamber and then declared it as a tax deduction, the actual cost of the contribution

would be \$480 since the deduction would lower the company's income tax bill by \$520. The proposed regulations would disallow part of this deduction if a "substantial" part of the Chamber's activities were lobbying. That is, if the IRS ruled that 75 percent of the Chamber's activities constituted lobbying, it presumably would disallow as a deduction 75 percent of what the company paid to the Chamber in dues.

Trade organizations fear this ruling will cut down on the contributions which finance all their activities. In addition, the organizations fear it will open up the broader question of whether they should enjoy general immunity from income tax laws.

A spokesman for the National Assn. of Manufacturers Oct. 9 said the proposed regulations regarding advertising campaigns do not clarify what ads would be tax deductible. He said there was no definition of just what constitutes lobbying.

The Chamber of Commerce of the U.S. Sept. 25 wrote its members: "Recent Supreme Court decisions have backed up IRS arguments that constitutional guarantees of freedom of speech and petition are not transgressed when money spent to influence legislation is disallowed as a tax deduction, even though the legislation would destroy the business. This form of censorship by taxation poses a serious problem for all business men."

Editor & Publisher, newspaper trade journal, Oct. 3 said: "We agree with the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants which recently stated: 'In our opinion, the disallowance of proper expenditures to promote or defeat legislation is an unfair penalty. Business enterprises should be permitted to combat injurious legislation or support favorable legislation and consider such expenses as part of the cost of doing business. It is unrealistic to disallow all such expenditures....'"

Elisha Hanson, general counsel of the American Newspaper Publishers Assn., Oct. 1 filed a brief with the House Ways and Means Committee, which will hold hearings starting Nov. 16 on the Nation's tax structure. The publishers' brief attacks the Supreme Court and IRS rulings regarding tax deductions.

A spokesman for the AFL-CIO Oct. 12 said labor was concerned about the part of the proposed regulations disallowing dues as a tax deduction. He said dues members pay to their unions were a legitimate business expense which should be deductible. He said to determine what portion of those dues should be disallowed because they went for lobbying or political campaigns would cost the Internal Revenue Service far more money than would be lost in allowing the deductions in the first place.

Dozens of trade organizations plan to protest the proposed regulations at the upcoming IRS hearing. No hearing date has been set.

Besides seeking remedy from the Internal Revenue Service directly, the trade organizations will continue to

support bills (HR 5193, 5251, 5579, 6367) pending before the House to amend the tax laws to allow deductions for expenses in lobbying for or against legislation.

Supreme Court Decisions

The Supreme Court Feb. 24, 1959 -- in an opinion delivered by Associate Justice John M. Harlan -- ruled that businesses could not deduct from their income money put into lobbying campaigns.

The Court decided two separate cases in the same opinion since they hinged on the same question.

One case involved William B. Cammarano and his wife, Louise, who jointly owned a one-fourth interest in a wholesale beer distributing firm in Washington state. The firm was a member of the Washington Beer Wholesalers Assn., which helped finance a campaign against letting the state take over the retail sale of wine and beer. Mr. and Mrs. Cammarano deducted on their 1948 income tax form the \$886.29 they said they contributed to the lobby campaign. The referendum on whether the state should take over the beer and wine sales was defeated Nov. 2, 1948.

The other case involved F. Strauss & Son Inc., wholesale liquor firm in Arkansas. Strauss and eight other Arkansas liquor wholesalers in May 1950 organized a campaign against a referendum to authorize statewide prohibition. The referendum was defeated Nov. 7, 1950. The Strauss firm on its 1950 income tax return deducted \$9,252.67 which it said it contributed to the lobbying campaign.

The Internal Revenue Service disallowed the deductions of Cammarano and Strauss on grounds they were not "ordinary and necessary" business expenses as defined in the IRS regulation.

In upholding the disallowance of the lobbying expenses, the Supreme Court said: "We think that the regulations must be construed to mean what they say -- that not only lobbying expenses, but also sums spent for 'the promotion or defeat of legislation, the exploitation of propaganda, including advertising other than trade advertising' are nondeductible."

Regarding the claim that lobbying against pending legislation was different from lobbying against initiative measures like referenda, the Court said: "We think that initiatives are plainly 'legislation' within the meaning of these regulations. Had the measures involved in these cases been passed by the people of Washington and Arkansas they would have the effect and status of ordinary laws in every respect...."

"It is contended that sums expended by a taxpayer to preserve his business from destruction are deductible as ordinary and necessary business expenses under the Code as a matter of law, and that therefore a regulation purporting to deny deductibility to such expenditures is plainly contrary to the statute and ipso facto invalid. Petitioners rely upon Commissioner v. Heininger, (320 U.S. 467) where this Court held that attorney's fees incurred by a mail-order dentist in resisting a postal fraud charge which would have ended his business were deductible as an ordinary and necessary business expense.

"We do not think Heininger governs the present cases, nor that it establishes as broad a rule of law as petitioners suggest. In Heininger this Court held no more than that expenditures without which a business enterprise would inevitably suffer adverse effects,

and the granting of deductibility to which would frustrate no 'sharply defined national or state policies,'... were deductible as ordinary and necessary business expenses under the statute. Here the deductions sought are prohibited by regulations which themselves constitute an expression of a sharply defined national policy, further demonstration of which may be found in other sections of the Internal Revenue Code...."

"In the present cases there is before us regulatory language of more than 40 years' continuous duration expressly providing that sums expended for the activities here involved shall not be considered as ordinary and necessary business expense under the statute. The provisions of the Internal Revenue Code which underlie the regulations have been repeatedly re-enacted by the Congress without the slightest suggestion that the policy expressed in these regulatory measures does other than precisely conform to its intent.... It is also noteworthy that Congress, in its 1954 re-enactment of the Internal Revenue Code, again adopted the 'ordinary and necessary' provision without substantive change, following consistent rulings by the courts subsequent to the 1939 re-enactment holding these regulations applicable to sums spent in efforts to persuade the general public of the desirability or undesirability of proposed legislation affecting the taxpayer's business...."

"Under these circumstances we think that the regulations have acquired the force of law. This is not a case where the Government seeks to cloak an interpretative regulation with immunity from judicial examination as to conformity with the statute on which it is based simply because Congress has for some period failed affirmatively to act to change the interpretation which the regulation gives to an otherwise unambiguous statute.... Here we have unambiguous regulatory language, adopted by the Commissioner in the early days of Federal income tax legislation, in continuous existence since that time, and consistently construed and applied by the courts on many occasions to deny deduction of sums expended in efforts to persuade the electorate, even when a clear business motive for the expenditure has been demonstrated.

First Amendment Claims

"Petitioners suggest that if the regulations are construed to deny them deduction, a substantial constitutional issue under the First Amendment is presented.... Petitioners are not being denied a tax deduction because they engage in constitutionally protected activities, but are simply being required to pay for those activities entirely out of their own pockets, as everyone else engaging in similar activities is required to do under the provisions of the Internal Revenue Code. Non-discriminatory denial of deduction from gross income to sums expended to promote or defeat legislation is plainly not 'aimed at the suppression of dangerous ideas.' (357 U.S. at 519) Rather, it appears to us to express a determination by Congress that since purchased publicity can influence the fate of legislation which will affect, directly or indirectly, all in the community, everyone in the community should stand on the same footing as regards its purchase so far as the Treasury of the United States is concerned."

COMPARISON OF CURRENT AND PROPOSED LOBBY TAX REGULATIONS

The Internal Revenue Service Sept. 19, 1959 published proposed regulations on the deductibility of lobbying expenses. The newly proposed regulations would succeed the standing regulation adopted in 1919. They also would supersede regulations proposed July 10, 1956 but never adopted. The texts of each follow.

1939 Code Reg.

Current IRS Regulation

"Sums of money expended for lobbying purposes, the promotion or defeat of legislation, the exploitation of propaganda, including advertising other than trade advertising, and contributions for campaign expenses, are not deductible from gross income."

1956 Proposed Regulations

"(c) Expenditures for lobbying purposes, for the promotion or defeat of legislation, for political purposes, or for the development or exploitation of propaganda (including advertising other than trade advertising) relating to any of the foregoing purposes, are not deductible from gross income. No payment made, either directly or through any organization, for the specific purpose of attempting to promote or defeat legislation shall be deductible. Other payments, not so made and otherwise meeting the requirements of the regulations under section 162, when made as dues or contributions to a trade or business organization, may be deductible under some circumstances, even though influencing, or attempting to influence, legislation is incidentally involved in the use by such organization of such payments. Thus, the payment of such amounts made as dues or contributions to --

"(1) A labor, agricultural or horticultural organization, exempt under section 501 (c) (5), or

"(2) A business league, chamber of commerce, real estate board or board of trade, exempt under section 501 (c) (6), for the furtherance of the general purposes and program of such an organization in promoting the common economic interests represented, shall be deductible in full if the activities of such organization which consist of lawfully attempting to promote or defend legislation are incidental to the organization's general purposes and program."

Newly Proposed Regulations

"(c) (1) Expenditures for lobbying purposes, for the promotion or defeat of legislation, for political campaign purposes (including the support or opposition to any candidate for public office), or for carrying on propaganda (including advertising) related to any of the foregoing purposes are not deductible from gross income. For example, the cost of advertising to promote or defeat legislation or to influence the public with respect to the desirability or undesirability of

proposed legislation is not deductible as a business expense, even though the legislation may directly affect the taxpayer's business. On the other hand, expenditures for institutional or 'good will' advertising which keeps the taxpayer's name before the public are generally deductible as ordinary and necessary business expenses provided the expenditures are related to the patronage the taxpayer might reasonably expect in the future. For example, a deduction will ordinarily be allowed for the cost of advertising which keeps the taxpayer's name before the public in connection with encouraging contributions to such organizations as the Red Cross, the purchase of United States Savings Bonds, or participation in similar causes. In like fashion, expenditures for advertising which present views on economic, financial, social, or other subjects of a general nature but which do not involve any of the activities specified in the first sentence of this subparagraph are deductible if they otherwise meet the requirements of the regulations under section 162.

"(2) Dues and other payments to an organization, such as a labor union or a trade association, which otherwise meet the requirements of the regulations under section 162, are deductible in full unless a substantial part of the organization's activities consists of one or more of those specified in the first sentence of subparagraph (1) of this paragraph. If a substantial part of the activities of the organization consists of one or more of those so specified, deduction will be allowed only for such portion of such dues and other payments as the taxpayer can clearly establish is attributable to activities other than those so specified. The determination as to whether such specified activities constitute a substantial part of an organization's activities shall be based on all the facts and circumstances. In no event shall special assessments or similar payments (including an increase in dues) made to any organization for any of such specified purposes be deductible.

"(3) Expenditures for the promotion or the defeat of legislation include, but shall not be limited to, expenditures for the purpose of attempting to --

"(i) Influence members of a legislative body directly or indirectly, by urging or encouraging the public to contact such members for the purpose of proposing, supporting or opposing legislation, or

"(ii) Influence the public to approve or reject a measure in a referendum, initiative, vote on a constitutional amendment or similar procedure."

TV QUIZ SHOWS

COMMITTEE -- House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Legislative Oversight Subcommittee.

RECESSED HEARINGS -- On alleged rigging of television quiz programs. (Weekly Report p. 1388)

TESTIMONY -- Oct. 7 -- Alfred Davis and Arthur Franklin, New York publicity men who worked for Barry-Enright, Inc., producers of the "Twenty-One" quiz show, said that when a grand jury investigation began in 1958 they were told by Edwin Slote, an attorney representing both them and the show, either "not to tell the truth" or to leave town to avoid testifying. They said quiz contestant Herbert Stempel had told them he was receiving questions and answers in advance, that they had discussed the matter with Daniel Enright, and he had said "there was nothing he could do about it."

Two former "Twenty-One" contestants, Rose Leibbrand and Richard Jackman, said they had been coached in advance. Miss Leibbrand said she was specifically restricted on the point value of questions she could elect to answer when she appeared on the program in 1956.

Thomas E. Ervin, National Broadcasting Co. vice president and general counsel, said Howard Felsher, producer of "Tic Tac Dough," a quiz show still on the air, was discharged Oct. 2 because he said he could not comply with Ervin's demand for a sworn statement that the show was not rigged.

Oct. 8 -- Three contestants on the "Dotto" quiz show testified they were supplied with questions and answers in advance. One of them, David Huschle, said the show's producers told him competition among quiz shows was so great they had to "insure" the program's success.

(NBC announced it had suspended Charles Van Doren, a network commentator who won \$129,000 on "Twenty-One" in 1956-57, "pending a final determination of the current Congressional investigation.")

(Subcommittee Chairman Oren Harris (D Ark.) said Van Doren had sent the group an Oct. 7 telegram denying any part in the alleged "Twenty-One" rigging and requesting an opportunity to be heard, but he had not replied to the Subcommittee's return telegram requesting his appearance within a day or two.

(Attorney General William P. Rogers, in a prepared speech for a Securities and Exchange Commission dinner, said, "Certainly there should be full accountability and thereafter every effort made by the Government and by the networks to safeguard against this or any other such public deception in the future.")

Oct. 9 -- Felsher said about 75 percent of the performances on the night version of "Tic Tac Dough" were rigged, and before the show was taken over by NBC in 1957 Enright had made all the decisions on which contestants should be fed advance information. He said he got in touch with some 20 to 30 contestants before his grand jury appearance, told them he intended to deny giving them advance information, and urged most of them to deny any coaching. He said although he first lied to the grand jury he returned later and admitted the charges. Felsher said the day-time version of "Tic Tac Dough" had been

rigged to some extent originally, but had not been "fixed" for the past year and a half because it was well established and could get along on its own.

Enright confirmed Felsher's testimony, said rigging of quiz shows had been a "practice for many, many years." He said "by my silence I might have condoned" Felsher's attempts to silence witnesses. He said the only way to keep quiz shows honest would be for networks to be in sole charge of preparing questions, with producers receiving them just before going on the air. Enright said one show he sold NBC -- "Concentration" -- never had been tampered with, "not for moral reasons," but "because it needed no artificial stimulant."

Enright said he didn't believe deception, in itself, was "necessarily bad" but should be measured in terms of "the hurt it inflicts on people." "A degree of deception is of considerable value in producing shows," he said. He termed "the one most reprehensible thing" for which he was responsible as co-owner of "Tic Tac Dough" the involvement of a 16-year-old girl in a rigging.

Oct. 10 -- Chairman John C. Doerfer of the Federal Communications Commission said neither he nor the New York prosecuting attorney "have been able to pinpoint any violation of the law" in quiz show rigging, and that "we can't determine who has been harmed...the home owner certainly didn't pay his way into the show." He said there were "many things that are fraudulent, deceitful and reprehensible that the law cannot reach" because of free speech guarantees and censorship bans, but that the FCC was studying the whole matter of network-advertising-sponsor relations in hopes of coming up "with an over-all rule." Doerfer said the FCC first heard reports of rigging in July 1958 and directed inquiries to the two major networks but received assurances none of their officials was involved.

Harris said Van Doren in his Oct. 7 telegram had requested that his denial of any guilt be inserted in the record, but this was being denied on grounds "nothing should go into the record without an opportunity to have it clarified" personally.

Oct. 12 -- Harris said a subpoena had been issued Oct. 9 for Van Doren to appear, but he had "purposely avoided service."

Chairman Earl W. Kintner of the Federal Trade Commission said his agency so far never had exercised jurisdiction over "deceptive entertainment" and "in my opinion there is a serious question whether such jurisdiction exists." He suggested that Congress could enact legislation making it a criminal offense to rig a TV show, adding, "it would have a salutary effect."

RELATED DEVELOPMENTS -- Oct. 14 -- Van Doren accepted service of the subpoena for his appearance when hearings resumed Nov. 2.

Doerfer, addressing the Radio Television News Directors Assn. in New Orleans, said pressures were building up that might force the FCC "to the brink of unconstitutional interference with freedom of expression on a political platform or in a dramatic performance," but that the cure for all "objectionable programming" should be "greater incentive for the exercise of self-regulatory restraints...."

REPUBLICANS COMPLETE OUTLINE OF LONG-TERM GOALS

The Republican Committee on Programs and Progress Oct. 10 and 13 released the final two sections of its report on "Decisions for a Better America." (For summary of first three sections, see Weekly Report p. 1386) Highlights of the final two sections:

Human Rights and Needs

"By 1976," the report said, "we will be a Nation of 240 million people -- 60 million more than today -- with a labor force close to 95 million and a gross national product approaching \$900 billion. Ninety-five million Americans will be under 20 in 1976. Twenty-two million will be over 65. Over one-third of the population will be living in the new suburbs that are springing up in every metropolitan area of the nation. The social and economic changes inherent in this growth are the concern of every American citizen and every branch of Government.

"We believe that the American people should accept no less than opportunity for productive jobs at good wages for every man and woman of working age; individual security, undiluted by inflation and excessive taxation; the most modern medical, hospital and health facilities; a world at peace with the atom serving humanity."

The report stated these basic beliefs:

"That Government has a positive responsibility to its people to maintain the conditions for a sound, productive economy....

"That every American must have access to the best education his individual endowments enable him to use....

"That every American should enjoy every reasonable protection against those conditions or accidents that threaten him with economic disaster through no fault of his own.

"That every American of whatever race or creed must have the chance to make his best contribution to society, to himself and his family, and to earn a status of respect."

The report emphasized that individual initiative was of primary importance in achieving these goals. "We returned constantly," it said, "to the plain and vital fact that self-reliance is the human resource we must look to for our margin of strength in the world ahead."

As for Government action, it said, "Human rights and needs are best served by agencies situated as close as possible to the individual.... The Federal Government has a role to play only when individuals, communities or states cannot by themselves do the things that must be done.... The Federal Government should so shape its programs as to stimulate and supplement, but not supplant, state, local and private action."

Education -- The report opposed "any proposal that would result in shifting to the Federal Government the responsibility for maintenance and operation of schools, including support of teachers' salaries." But it endorsed a program of "matching Federal grants for elementary and secondary classroom construction where need is demonstrated and local resources are clearly inade-

quate." The grants, it said, should be paid in installments over a period of years "to minimize the immediate impact on the Federal budget."

The report also said assistance to colleges for construction of dormitory and classroom buildings "is justified in some instances." It recommended making community colleges eligible for matching grants for mathematics, science and language teaching equipment.

Civil Rights -- The report said "unconstitutional barriers" to voting "must be speedily removed;" "vigorous programs" should be developed to assure equality of opportunity in employment, education, health services and housing; and "high priority" should be given to "the peaceful and orderly transition" to "the day when segregation is completely eliminated in public places."

It said the Government should:

"Adhere firmly to the principle that the rule of law is supreme.

"Take effective action to deal with persons who use force or threats of force to obstruct court orders in school desegregation cases.

"Make full use of its investigative powers" in school and church bombing cases.

Give statutory authority to the President's Committee on Government Contracts.

"Establish effective, equal opportunity in all Government-supported and Government-subsidized housing and enforce non-discrimination rulings in all other governmental activities."

Housing -- The report said "millions of new dwelling units must be built," but did not make specific recommendations on existing Federal programs in this field.

Health -- Citing the need for increased medical facilities and personnel, the report said the Federal Government should carry out these "partnership" programs:

"Assistance in the construction of buildings needed to accommodate the increased enrollment in schools of medicine, dentistry and public health if... (other) resources prove inadequate...."

Grants for a "renovation and repair of outmoded urban hospitals."

"Mortgage guarantees for the construction of private nursing homes...."

It also said the Government should help private groups build health facilities in remote rural areas and mental health clinics and help metropolitan areas plan and coordinate health services.

The report urged "continued Federal support for basic medical research," but said non-Federal sources should provide at least half the total needed money.

It called for strengthening of Federal water and air pollution laws and increased support for radiological health activities under the National Radiation Council.

Vocational Rehabilitation -- The report recommended a steady expansion of the Federal-state program of vocational rehabilitation to a figure "of at least 200,000 (persons) annually."

Welfare Programs -- The report said "we will have to devise methods for transferring pension rights in industrial and union retirement funds" to preserve the mobility of the labor force.

It said "workmen's compensation benefits should be made more adequate" and "unemployment compensation should be liberalized to deal with temporary unemployment and provide for coverage in periods of retraining."

It said public assistance programs should be available "to any person who is hungry, homeless, disabled or sick," but the Federal share of the cost should not be increased. Greater emphasis should be placed on "the prevention of dependency" and "existing limitations on eligibility for aid to dependent children" that put a "premium on broken homes" should be removed.

Health Insurance -- The report said "much remains to be done in the field of health insurance for people over 65.... We reject as unsound...a compulsory hospital and medical insurance law administered as part of the social security system.... Depending upon the rapidity with which effective medical and health insurance programs for the aged are developed by private insurers, it may become necessary for the states and the Federal Government to aid individuals who cannot obtain such post-retirement illness insurance under any private group plan. This agency would purchase such insurance for its participants from non-profit groups and insurance companies."

Economic Progress

The report said "the Republican purpose" in the economic field was to "lift the ceiling over personal opportunity (and) strengthen the floor over the pit of personal disaster."

But it warned that "methods that encourage...dependence on governmental authority are worse than wrong. They are wicked.... It is not enough that legislation be well-meaning, that it generously help those who are in real need. It should do so in ways that do not tempt into dependence and half-effort...."

The report laid down four basic "principles for economic progress:"

(1) "The best means ever devised to plan and organize the production people want is through private initiative exercised in competitive markets.... We reject the idea that Government price fixing, wage control, production planning or materials control make sense in peacetime.

(2) "No...forced distribution of economic gains, and no amount of compulsion or state planning, will make for economic progress in America unless we preserve and enhance the stake for individual effort.

(3) "A dependable dollar is essential to the strong and steady economic growth we seek.

(4) "Government has a responsibility to move effectively against either depression or inflation."

The report raked the Democratic record on economic affairs and attacked the Democratic approach to the attainment of sustained economic growth: "This new cult of forced growth calls for massive Government intervention, mainly through deficit spending programs and super-easy credit. Inflation, the energizing force of this process, is either to be accepted as the cost of seeking higher growth rates or it is to be 'contained' by direct controls on prices, wages, materials, production and trade.... We believe that this whole line of thinking can lead only to trouble for the American people."

On the other hand, the report said, "wise public and private policies...should attain sustained growth in the vicinity of 4 percent a year." The growth "would give us a \$900 billion economy by 1976...enable us to keep strong against the critical assault by Communist imperialism...give us the means to remove the last blights of poverty from the land...yield a flow in income large enough to lift the standard of living of the average American family by 50 percent within a generation...."

Agriculture -- Asserting that "the modern family-type farm must remain the backbone of American agriculture in the years ahead," the report said:

"For the six 'basic' crops, we favor proceeding step-by-step toward levels of price support that will move these crops into regular marketing channels and not into indefinite Government storage...."

"An interim plan should be considered under which a substantially larger acreage than at present would be voluntarily retired from crop production for the next five to ten years under the conservation reserve program...."

"A 'Food for Peace' program should be developed which will help match our agricultural abundance with the unfilled needs of our friends abroad...."

"We should press forward vigorously with programs of research to develop new foreign and domestic markets, including new industrial uses, for our farm products...."

"The Rural Development Program (to help farmers in low income rural areas) should be pressed as vigorously as is feasible."

Labor -- The report applauded the 1959 labor reform bill (PL 86-257); urged "broader application of fair labor standards, together with strong unemployment insurance and social security systems; advocated "technical and financial aid to areas of chronic unemployment in cooperation with state and local agencies;" and recommended improved education, training, testing, counseling and job placement services.

Business -- The report applauded and urged continuation of Eisenhower Administration policies of "vigorous, impartial enforcement of laws against monopoly" and "encouragement of new and small business."

Power -- The report said, "We favor the teamwork principle in the development of facilities to utilize the Nation's full and practical potential for hydroelectric power.... The Federal Government should not enter the thermal power field by building steam plants.... We also believe that...non-Federal organizations can carry out most of the applied research and development required for the successful utilization of atomic power."

Water -- The report said, "We believe in a vigorous Federal effort, supplementing that of non-Federal organizations, to impound water, to irrigate land, to control floods, and to find an economical way to convert saline and brackish water to fresh.... (We recommend) that every feasible effort be made in the use of reclaimed lands to recognize the problems of current agricultural surpluses."

Minerals -- The report endorsed existing programs "to develop and wisely utilize our own (mineral) resources."

Public Lands -- The report favored "the use of suitable public lands for an expanding program of park and recreational development.... Federal land policy should also recognize the valid claims of grazing, timber, water, mining and industrial activities to use public lands, where these uses do not conflict with a reasonable conservation policy."

Transportation -- The report said there was a need for "better coordination of the varied Federal programs assisting transportation" and "a much closer relationship between the Government's regulatory agencies in the area of transportation."

Control of Spending -- The report said these steps "must be taken in order to reduce wasteful Federal expenditures":

"The President and those Members of Congress who are seeking to check expenditures with a low national priority, must have strong support from the public at large against the demands of organized, narrow interest groups.

"We need new legislative procedures that will enable Members of Congress to see, at any time, what impact their actions on individual money bills will have upon the total budget.

"Each budget, when presented to Congress, should indicate the nature of expenditure trends into ensuing years....

"The President should have power to veto individual items in global authorizations or appropriations....

"Consideration should be given to the creation of a continuing citizen body of the Hoover Commission type to review Government operations and make recommendations to increase efficiency."

Balanced Budget -- The report said, "We can and we must pay as we go for the cost of Government.... This does not mean that the Federal budget will never show a temporary deficit.... But deficit financing must not be carried over into periods of prosperity."

Tax Reform -- The report said "major reform" of the tax system "is clearly contingent on the prospect of a surplus beyond the needs of debt retirement." When reform was possible, the committee advocated:

"Some reduction of personal income tax rates in all brackets, even though necessarily small at the outset... bringing down the ceiling surtax rate to a more equitable level; more liberal provisions for averaging of widely fluctuating incomes; a lower tax on capital gains that result from genuine venture investment and withdrawal of capital gains treatment from a number of activities that clearly do not merit it; and better enforcement of collection of taxes on certain kinds of incomes, such as by withholding of tax on corporate bond interest and dividends, if further study indicates its practicality....

"Some modest reduction in the over-all corporate tax rate; more favorable treatment of corporate income under \$25,000, for the benefit of new and small business; and improvement in depreciation allowances....

"Federal excise taxes, too, badly need reform.... Congress should consider converting our present selective excises, other than liquor and tobacco taxes, to a more broadly based tax at a rate substantially lower than those in effect. This should be imposed at the manufacturers' level so as not to invade the area of sales taxes upon which state and local governments depend heavily."

Money and Credit -- The report stressed the importance of "an independent Federal Reserve System" and deplored "the steady attack by leading members of the opposition in Congress on the efforts of the System to defend the currency."

It said, "We reject the idea that the Federal Reserve System should resort to a policy of loose money to make it easier for the Treasury to borrow.... The Treasury should, of course, endeavor to keep down interest charges on the public debt. But the best way to cut them is not by manipulating interest rates; it is by reducing the size of the debt.... To facilitate debt management operations, the Treasury should be freed by Congress of statutory interest rate limitations on longer term borrowing."

DEMOCRATIC POLICY VIEWS

The advisory committee on science and technology of the Democratic Advisory Council Oct. 11 held its first meeting and proposed establishment of a new Federal scientific agency to investigate technological problems affecting U.S. foreign policy.

The committee, established in April, was expected to write the science plank of the 1960 Democratic platform. (Weekly Report p. 601)

It proposed that the new agency deal first with problems of disarmament. It said "abysmally little" is known about the technical problems in this field and "a sizable amount" should be spent on disarmament research.

Later, it suggested, the agency could consider scientific aspects of aid to underdeveloped areas and other foreign policy problems.

It recommended the agency be an independent arm of Government, with liaison with established departments.

The Democratic group's proposals differed sharply from the recent report of the Republican Committee on Programs and Progress, which suggested the Federal Government's role in "applied research... be held to present levels or perhaps gradually diminished." (Weekly Report p. 1386).

Dr. Harold C. Urey, one of the Democratic science advisers, described the Republican report as "platitudinous."

In another development, the administrative committee of the Democratic Advisory Council Oct. 7 criticized the Treasury's Oct. 1 decision to set a 5 percent interest rate on its latest issue of U.S. notes. (Weekly Report p. 1388)

Its statement said the Treasury action was "yet another round of the 'banker's bonus,' which has seen interest charges on the U.S. debt increased by more than \$3 billion... since 1952."

The statement said the Treasury's action "means that rates for small business, farm, home-buying and consumer borrowing will be even higher.... The Administration has made a seven-year mess of fiscal and monetary policy. To blame this on anything the Congress did or didn't do in 1959 is neither credible or honest."

REPUBLICAN PRESIDENTIAL RACE

The week's major developments in the Republican Presidential race (Weekly Report p. 1350, 1385):

• NIXON -- Vice President Richard M. Nixon Oct. 5-10 spoke at nonpartisan and Republican gatherings in Illinois, Indiana, Texas and Oregon. At almost every stop, he discussed international affairs and his experiences in dealing with Soviet Premier Nikita Khrushchev. Along

the way, Nixon also said the 1960 Republican candidate -- whoever he is -- "has to run on the policies of the Eisenhower Administration."

● **ROCKEFELLER** -- New York Gov. Nelson A. Rockefeller (R), continuing to take a "hard" line on U.S.-Russian relations, Oct. 8 warned that increased trade with the Soviet bloc could be a "Trojan horse" tactic which would enable Communists "to disrupt and dominate world trade." (Weekly Report p. 1384)

In return, Rockefeller Oct. 10 was criticized by Georgi Z. Zhukov, a top Khrushchev aide, as one of "those politicians who are out of step with the time, who are harping on the old tunes and who are trying to return the world to the cold war."

● **NEW HAMPSHIRE PRIMARY** -- New Hampshire Gov. Wesley Powell (R) Oct. 6 said he was prepared to support Sen. Styles Bridges (R N.H.) as a favorite son candidate in the March 8 New Hampshire Presidential primary. Powell had been wooed by backers of both Nixon and Rockefeller, and it was not immediately clear what effect his statement would have on the prospects of either of them in the New Hampshire race. Both Nixon and Rockefeller recently made "nonpolitical" visits to the state. (Weekly Report p. 1351, 1385)

● **BENSON** -- Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Taft Benson, back from a trip to Russia and other European countries, Oct. 9 said he was "not a candidate" for the Vice Presidency or any other office. He said he planned to return to the governing board of the Mormon church in 1961.

● **LODGE** -- Henry Cabot Lodge Jr., U.S. ambassador to the United Nations, Oct. 9 said, "I have no intention to run for any elective office at all" in 1960.

DEMOCRATIC PRESIDENTIAL RACE

The week's major developments in the Democratic Presidential race (Weekly Report p. 1309):

● **CHANDLER** -- Kentucky Gov. A.B. (Happy) Chandler (D) Oct. 12 announced he would seek the 1960 Democratic Presidential nomination. Chandler, whose term as Governor expires Dec. 8, was Kentucky's favorite son candidate in 1956. The man he backed as his successor as Governor was defeated in the May 26 Democratic primary. (Weekly Report p. 748)

Chandler said he planned to enter Presidential primaries in New Hampshire, Wisconsin and Indiana.

● **BOWLES** -- Rep. Chester Bowles (D Conn.) Oct. 10 said he was not a "dark horse" candidate for President and would vote for Sen. John F. Kennedy (D Mass.) at the Democratic convention. The Connecticut Democratic organization has endorsed Kennedy. (Weekly Report p. 1061)

Bowles said his support for Kennedy "in no way diminishes my continuous admiration and friendship for... Sen. Hubert H. Humphrey (D Minn.)."

● **JOHNSON** -- Sen. Lyndon B. Johnson (D Texas) Oct. 11 denied a new flurry of reports that he was about to become an active candidate for the Presidential nomination.

Appearing for the first time on a television network interview program, Johnson said: "As I have stated many times, I am not a candidate for President. I do not intend to become a candidate for President.... I think it's very unlikely that the convention would nominate any person that was not a candidate. If the convention should do that and should ask me to serve, then I would have to take a look at it, but I do not anticipate any such eventuality."

He also denied the accuracy of a copyrighted report in the Dallas Morning News Oct. 6 that he would seek the nomination if he became convinced "that the people of his state and moderates of other states really want to battle the liberal element in the Democratic party."

Johnson's close friend and political mentor, House Speaker Sam Rayburn (D Texas), Oct. 7 said, "Lyndon says he is not a candidate, but his friends are going to have another idea about that between now and the Democratic convention."

● **BROWN** -- California Gov. Edmund G. (Pat) Brown (D) Oct. 11 said he had asked his California backers "not to do anything" about launching a serious Presidential boom in his behalf. Lionel Steinberg, state party vice chairman, Sept. 26 had announced plans for such a drive. (Weekly Report p. 1385)

Brown also said he would "probably be a favorite son" in the June 7 California Presidential primary and would "play just as important a role as I can in seeing that the Democratic party selects the best possible candidate... a good, liberal, fighting candidate who can carry the message to the people...."

Brown repeated his previous statement that the positions of a Texan on oil and natural gas rates and civil rights "would make it very difficult" for Sen. Lyndon B. Johnson (D Texas) to carry California if he were the Democratic Presidential candidate.

AUTO WORKERS CONVENTION

The United Auto Workers (AFL-CIO) convention Oct. 12 adopted a policy statement urging realignment of both parties along ideological lines but opposing formation of a third party.

The stand echoed the position taken by the AFL-CIO convention in September. (Weekly Report p. 1350)

Walter P. Reuther, president of the politically-active UAW, Oct. 8 said an "unholy alliance" of Southern Democrats and Northern Republicans controlled the 1959 session of Congress. But he backed UAW Vice President Leonard Woodcock in urging delegates not to let their disappointment with Congress lead them into a third party.

Reuther also said he had no personal choice in the 1960 Presidential race and would take no position on a candidate until after the party nominations had been made.

CONNECTICUT ELECTIONS

Municipal elections and a special election for the state house of representatives Oct. 5 gained back for Connecticut Republicans some of the ground they lost to Democrats in the sweep of 1958. The GOP had a net gain of five town governments and regained the house by a majority of one.

STEEL INJUNCTION

President Eisenhower Oct. 9 issued an executive order invoking the 80-day injunction clause of the Taft-Hartley Act in the steel strike. The following statement by the President accompanied the executive order (see p. 1419):

After carefully studying the circumstances surrounding the 13-week-old steel strike, I have concluded that, if permitted to continue, this strike would imperil the national health and safety. The national interest demands an immediate resumption of production in this vital industry.

To bring about a resumption of production, I am invoking the statutory means which Congress has provided for that purpose. I have today issued an executive order appointing a board of inquiry to examine immediately into the issues of this dispute and to submit to me the report prescribed by law.

The strike has closed 85 percent of the Nation's steel mills, shutting off practically all new supplies of steel. Over 500,000 steel workers and about 200,000 workers in related industries, together with their families, have been deprived of their usual means of support. Present steel supplies are low and the resumption of full-scale production will require some weeks. If production is not quickly resumed, severe effects upon the economy will endanger the economic health of the Nation.

I profoundly regret that the parties to the dispute have failed to resolve their differences through the preferred methods of free collective bargaining, even though every appropriate Government service was available to them in support of their efforts. I have been advised by both parties that negotiations between them have broken down and that they see no hope for an early voluntary settlement.

Nevertheless, I want to emphasize that the action I have taken in no way relieves the parties of their grave obligation to the American people to resume negotiations and reach a just and responsible settlement at the earliest possible time.

U.S.-MEXICAN STATEMENT

Following is the text of the joint communique issued Oct. 12 by President Eisenhower and President Adolfo Lopez Mateos of Mexico:

During the visit of President Adolfo Lopez Mateos to Washington, President Dwight D. Eisenhower and the President of Mexico renewed and strengthened the friendship which began at their meeting at Acapulco, Mexico, last February. Informally and without an agenda they exchanged views on general subjects of mutual interest to Mexico and the United States and on subjects of hemispheric and world concern in that atmosphere of cordiality and frankness which characterizes true friendship.

With regard to economic problems of much interest to public opinion in Mexico, the two Presidents noted with satisfaction the recent strengthening of the Mexican economy. Special mention was made of the fact that although Mexico has had at its disposal since January of the current year a balance of payments credit from the Export-Import Bank in the amount of \$100 million, it has proved unnecessary to make use of more than a small part of this credit.

The Presidents were also heartened by the progress made towards resolving important commodity problems and consequent improvements in world market conditions with respect to basic commodities produced in Mexico and the United States, including the strengthening of cotton prices, the signature of the coffee agreement and the improved outlook for a better balance of supply and demand in world markets for lead and zinc.

The Presidents agreed that maintenance of the productive capacity of the Mexican mining industry is essential to Mexico's economic progress and to the security of the United States. Consequently, the Governments of both countries will continue to consult each other and the other lead and zinc-producing countries with regard to the measures necessary to achieve these objectives.

The problems of the United States and Mexico regarding the exploitation and conservation of the economic resources of

the seas were explored by the two Presidents, and they agreed that efforts should be made to provide for the orderly use of these resources.

It was agreed that the Mexican and American scientific communities should work more closely together.

The two Presidents also expressed gratification at the cooperation which has developed in seeking solutions to common health problems and they will instruct the health authorities of the two countries to broaden the area of joint action to the greatest possible extent. The excellent progress made in the eradication of malaria in Mexico was noted, and the hope was expressed that through international cooperation similar success could be achieved in the other countries of the hemisphere where malaria is still a significant problem.

At Camp David, the two Presidents chose the name Amistad Dam to designate the dam proposed to be constructed near Del Rio, Texas, and Villa Acuna, Coahuila, for flood control, conservation and storage of the waters of the Rio Grande, and possibly power generation.

Like the Acapulco meeting, the Washington visit demonstrated the firm resolve of the two chiefs of state and of the two Governments to continue to examine their problems with understanding and respect for each other's points of view in efforts to find solutions that are mutually beneficial to the peoples of Mexico and the United States.

The two Presidents are convinced of the value of continuing a personal relationship between the chiefs of state of Mexico and the United States, not merely to provide an opportunity for cordial and frank exchanges of views on common problems, but more importantly, to sponsor the continued growth of friendship between the two countries and their Governments.

Lastly, the two Presidents expressed their belief that their personal friendship and the growing cooperation between their countries in all fields of human endeavor will be an example to the world of how two nations can live independently side by side in friendship, cooperative effort and mutual understanding.

FEDERAL HIGHWAY PROGRAM

President Eisenhower Oct. 9 sent the following letter to Sen. Albert Gore (D Tenn.) in reply to a Sept. 16 letter from Gore to the President (see p. 1416):

Dear Sen. Gore:

This is in further reply to your letter of Sept. 16 concerning the Federal-aid highway program and the annual apportionment of funds to the states.

Since enactment of the 1959 legislation this whole question has been the subject of careful consideration in the Executive establishment. In addition, as you know, on several recent occasions members of the Administration have discussed this problem in great detail with various representative groups of Governors.

Last January I recommended that the Congress increase the gas tax by 1-1/2 cents, to be effective July 1, 1959. This additional amount of money would have been sufficient to allow the highway program to continue at the accelerated rate which had been authorized in the 1958 highway legislation. However, enactment of a 1-cent increase in the gas tax, with an effective date of Oct. 1, 1959, has resulted in smaller revenue to the Highway Trust Fund than would have resulted from my request, and is directly responsible for the problem with which we are confronted today.

I should like to emphasize that this Administration fully intends promptly to honor bills presented to it by the various states. In studying ways to achieve this objective while still adhering to the legislative directive establishing the "pay-as-you-go" principle in the Highway Act of 1956, it became obvious that if we were to be equitable to all of the states we would need to schedule the use of the existing unobligated authorizations. Without such scheduling, which will apply only to the letting of new contracts, we would face the untenable alternative of serious disruption of the program in the fiscal year 1961. In my opinion, any other course of action would be fiscally irresponsible and

certainly would not be consistent with proper management of a trust fund which is established for a specific purpose, particularly in the face of a Congressional decision to limit the increase in trust fund revenues to two-thirds of the amount requested.

If, as you have suggested, Congress takes further action at its next session to provide, in an acceptable manner, additional revenues for the Trust Fund, the scheduling now contemplated will be adjusted to meet the new situation. Lacking such action by Congress, it is clear to me that the orderly scheduling of new contracts is the only prudent and equitable course to follow.

With warm regard,

Sincerely,
DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER

GLOBAL AID PLAN

Following are excerpts from President Eisenhower's address at ground-breaking ceremonies Oct. 13 for the Eisenhower Presidential Library in Abilene, Kan. (see p.1419):

...When you of my age were youngsters, William Allen White was disturbed by the fact that Kansas was losing population. What would he say today about the rapid growth of Kansas and the swelling population of the Nation?

What would be his reaction to present estimates that while our country's population is increasing to 275 million in the next 30 years, the world's population will be nearly five billion people?

Many peoples of the world, once dominated and submissive, are now and will continue to be involved in a great ferment, explosive in its potential. Everywhere, knowledge and ideas, spread by modern communications, are routing centuries of ignorance and superstition. Peoples now know that poverty and suppression are neither universal nor are they inevitable.

Increasingly and insistently, they are demanding the elimination of the human indignities of starvation, ill-health, and peonage. They want independence, individual freedom and responsible government.

These increasingly numerous periods of tomorrow's world will multiply those wants and they will have at their disposal both more constructive and more destructive capacity than the world has known before.

Now how do you believe this capacity will be used? What decisions will you make in this regard? These are sobering questions. They deserve your most earnest consideration. For if the growing power of free men is wisely and skillfully applied toward the common aspirations of humanity, then a world of peace and plenty becomes a high probability.

You know that the free nations of the world have the capacity and can develop the will to overcome together the powerful, perplexing forces which for thousands of years have yielded hate, distrust, poverty.

Humanity's upward climb involves complex economic, educational and political problems, all of which cry for wisdom as we seek solutions, as we search for world understanding....

Obviously, a program for peaceful progress calls for intelligent economic, educational and political cooperation; economic cooperation which promises that people everywhere may, by concerted effort, conquer hunger and disease, and lift their levels of living; educational cooperation to develop that genuine human understanding on which all other cooperative activity must be based; and political cooperation, not only to settle disputes which continuously arise in an imperfect world, but also to build the social structures that encourage man in his striving for a better life.

Now, any reasonable person will recognize that no one nation, even with the legendary strength of an Atlas, could long support the world on its shoulders.

Each nation will progress only if its own people and leaders recognize that the major responsibility for improvement is theirs. Even if every other nation were as generous as the United States has been in recent years, this would still be so.

But this does not imply that we or any other fortunate people may be indifferent to the welfare of others. We cannot today live -- either in domestic or international life with the long obsolete picture of the factory owner living on a hilltop in isolated riches and splendor, wholly indifferent to the aspirations and just demands of the oppressed multitudes in the plains below.

Clearly one objective of American foreign policy is and must be to help build a world economy in which each nation finds it

possible to earn its own keep and to pay its own way, and do so in a manner which brings meaning and fulfillment to the lives of its citizens. Such a policy is crucial to our own prosperity and security; it is vital to the cause of a just and lasting peace.

I believe, and I trust you believe, that every free nation should have this policy. I further believe -- and hope you agree -- that the free nations of the world, motivated by both humanitarianism and self-interest -- should cooperate voluntarily in a long-range program aimed at helping the presently less-privileged peoples work step by step toward a better life.

Every nation should contribute to the common enterprise in whatever way it can. No nation should be deemed incapable of contributing in some fashion to the worldwide goal.

The ingredients of this assistance must be technical services, private and public loans, dependable, mutually helpful trade relationships, grants in emergency situations, security help in transition years, and, above all, continuing efforts to build true understanding among nations and peoples, without which all else will fail.

Foreign capital helped our own country make spectacular progress during the first three-quarters of the 19th century -- capital which over a 40-year period we repaid with interest. So, too, can private and public capital, under the right conditions, now assist the less-developed nations make sound progress toward the achievement of their goals. Those "right conditions" must include both an honorable and responsible attitude within the nations needing the capital and intelligent trade relations among all free nations.

No other aspiration dominates my own being so much as this: That the nations of East and West will find dependable, self-guaranteeing methods to reduce the vast and essentially wasteful expenditures for armaments, so that part of the savings may be used in a comprehensive and effective effort for world improvement.

As the less developed nations succeed in establishing viable economies and raising their living standards, our own economy will soar to new heights and our technology will be challenged as never before. Burdensome surpluses -- even those of wheat -- will disappear. Indeed, the world may then be threatened with very real deficits -- of food, energy, minerals. Enlarged demand throughout the world will have to be met by new methods, and more effective use of resources everywhere.

The world must learn to work together -- or finally it will not work at all.

This is not a problem for the distant future. Within the lifetime of many of you here today the global population will be five billion. You must now help determine how such a vast humanity may, in freedom, achieve stupendous increases in economic output, and increase the sum of human happiness on this earth....

Our forefathers who pioneered this land were concerned initially with individual family welfare. Soon, however, they developed allegiance to larger communities -- the state and nation -- and in doing so they did not diminish their devotion to family or local community; indeed, they strengthened it. If they saw the world as it is today, they would be the first to realize that peoples everywhere must now achieve an allegiance to the wider, free-world community, and doing so they will thereby strengthen, make more meaningful -- their devotion to family, to state, and nation..."

OTHER STATEMENTS

Other recent public statements by President Eisenhower:

Sept. 30 -- Executive order empowering the Federal Aviation Agency to include in contracts with industry a clause providing that payments to an assignee of money due or to become due under the contract would not be subject to reduction or set-off.

Sept. 30 -- Toast to the President of Italy made by President Eisenhower at a White House luncheon honoring Italian Prime Minister Antonio Segni.

Sept. 30 -- Executive order delegating to the Secretary of Defense and Atomic Energy Commission, acting jointly, authority to determine whether various international exchanges of atomic material and information under a 1958 law (PL 85-479) promote, and do not endanger, the common defense effort. (1958 Almanac p. 253)

Oct. 2 -- Greeting to U.S. Jews for the Jewish new year.

Oct. 3 -- Message thanking Soviet Premier Nikita Khrushchev for gifts given to the President during Khrushchev's visit to the U.S.

'RECORD' DRAWN INTO BATTLE OF THE BUDGET

The Congressional Record has been drawn into the running budget battle between President Eisenhower and the Democratic-controlled Congress.

The Congressional Record, called The Record in Washington, supposedly is the word-for-word debate on the Senate and House floors. In addition, the Record contains an appendix where Members of Congress place material ranging from their speeches to recipes to the French dueling code.

At the height of the budget battle in 1959, the Democratic leadership began running daily tables on the last page of The Record showing how Congress treated President Eisenhower's money requests.

One of the two tables was labelled "New Obligational Authority Provided Outside the Appropriation Process (So-Called Backdoor Financing)." Several Republicans charged this table was rigged to make it appear Congressional Democrats were aiding the President's economy campaign.

The controversy renewed interest in long-standing proposals to lay down stricter rules regarding revision of actual debate before it is printed in The Record and the scope of material eligible for the appendix.

Standing Law

An act approved Jan. 12, 1895 (44 USC 181) states that "the Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the Congressional Record, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings, shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk...."

The Joint Committee, consisting of three Members from the Senate, three from the House, under that 1895 Act has drawn up 12 rules regarding the publication of material in The Record. None of these rules, however, limits the extent a Member of Congress can revise what he actually said on the floor before it is printed in The Record.

The Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 gave the Joint Printing Committee permission to have a Daily Digest of Congressional activity printed in the back of The Record. The Daily Digest staff members until 1959 had printed a "Resume of Congressional Activity" the first day of every month Congress was in session. This resume included a table showing whether Congress had appropriated more or less money than the President requested.

1959 Clash

Starting July 6, 1959 this monthly appropriations table began running in The Record every day, although there is no record of the Joint Printing Committee requesting the change. Rep. Thomas B. Curtis (R Mo.),

member of the House Republican economy bloc, protested the change two months after it went into effect.

At the same time Curtis protested the printing in the digest of the second "back-door spending" table showing how Congress had handled the President's requests for money for such continuing programs as urban renewal. These are the so-called back door spending programs since the money is paid out over several years without Congress giving its permission each year.

The back-door spending table began running daily on Aug. 21, 1959. Senate Majority Leader Lyndon B. Johnson (D Texas) obtained unanimous consent on the floor that day to run the second table. "The American people are entitled to get the cold, hard facts on just what the Congress has done on all requests for appropriations and new obligational authority," Johnson said in his unanimous consent request. The back-door spending table was prepared by Max Lehrer, assistant staff director of Johnson's Aeronautical and Space Sciences Committee. Lehrer joined the Committee in 1959 after serving as director of economic and fiscal analysis in the Defense Department. The Bureau of the Budget, which is responsible to President Eisenhower, verified as accurate the figures Lehrer presented in the table.

Curtis Sept. 11 claimed the back-door spending table "is unquestionably the result of political partisanship and is designed to be political propaganda." He said the budget battle should be debated on the floor instead of "destroying the reputation for fairness and impartiality the Daily Digest and Congressional Record have established over a period of years." Senate Minority Leader Everett McKinley Dirksen (R Ill.) Sept. 15 said the appropriations table was "incomplete and inaccurate" while the back door spending one was "wrong in several respects." Johnson countered that all the figures had been cleared with the Bureau of the Budget.

Outlook

Curtis Sept. 30 told Congressional Quarterly he would insist when Congress reconvened that the Joint Printing Committee find out who ordered the appropriations table printed on a daily rather than a monthly basis. He said he would also push his resolution (H Res 176) to require that any remarks not actually spoken on the floor be printed in the Congressional Record in italics.

The upshot of the argument over the financial tables promises to build up support for measures like the one proposed by Curtis. Other proposals pending in the House Administration or Senate Rules and concerning the Congressional Record:

HR 7676, SPONSORED BY REP. PAUL C. JONES (D MO.) -- Would forbid material irrelevant to the legislation being considered from being printed in The Record's debate section and relevant material not actually spoken

would be limited to one page. Would also forbid Members of Congress to place irrelevant material in the appendix of The Record more than once a week.

HR 7687, SPONSORED BY REP. CHARLES M. TEAGUE (R CALIF.) -- Same as HR 7676 except that irrelevant material could be inserted in the appendix only five times during the session and would be limited to a half-page each time.

HR 7953, SPONSORED BY REP. WALTER H. MOELER (D OHIO) -- Material not relevant to legislation on either the House or Senate legislative calendars could not be inserted in the debate section. Irrelevant material could be put in the appendix by a Member of Congress 10 times during each session with each insertion limited to one page. The parliamentarian would decide on relevancy.

S RES 168, SPONSORED BY SENS. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER (D ORE.) AND GORDON ALLOTT (R COLO.) -- Would forbid "changes of substantive nature or changes concerning remarks of another Senator" made on the floor of the Senate. The resolution, would add a new rule to the Senate rules, would allow changes "only to correct grammar and syntax and to correct actual errors made in the recording" of remarks on the floor.

FEDERAL HIGHWAY PROGRAM

Developments in the controversy on the financing of the National Interstate and Defense Highway System:

Oct. 9 -- President Eisenhower wrote Sen. Albert Gore (D Tenn.) in reply to Gore's charges that the Administration planned to default in fiscal 1960 on \$157 million in obligations to the states for Interstate System work, and that the Administration through contract controls planned to hold allocations to the states in fiscal 1960-62 for Interstate System work to levels below those authorized by Congress. (For the Administration's schedule of fiscal 1960-1961 allocations to the states for highway work, see next page.) Gore had said the Administration preferred reducing the pace of work on the Interstate System to asking Congress for a direct appropriation to supplement funds in the Highway Trust Fund, which finances Interstate System work on a "pay-as-you-go" basis. (Weekly Report p. 1389)

The President's letter, in reply to the first charge, said the Administration "fully intends promptly to honor bills presented to it by the various states." In reply to the second charge, the President said that since the Highway Trust Fund would not have the funds in fiscal 1960-62 to finance Interstate System work at the level authorized by Congress, there was no alternative under the "pay-as-you-go" requirement but to cut back allocations to the level for which funds would be available.

The President recalled that in 1959 he asked Congress for a 1½-cent per gallon gasoline tax increase, which he said would have brought enough money into the Highway Trust Fund to keep work going at the pace authorized by Congress, but that Congress had authorized only a 1-cent increase (PL 86-342). If Congress in 1960 agreed "to provide, in an acceptable manner," additional revenues for the Trust Fund, levels of work would be adjusted upward, Mr. Eisenhower said. (For text see p. 1413)

Oct. 12 -- Rep. Gordon H. Scherer (R Ohio), third-ranking GOP member on the House Public Works Committee, said a special 18-member Federal-Aid Highway Program Subcommittee appointed Sept. 4 by Public Works Chairman Charles A. Buckley (D N.Y.) had been "stacked" against highway progress. Scherer spoke at the 45th annual convention of the Assn. of State Highway Officials in Boston. He said the special group had been created because the existing standing Roads Subcommittee would not "succumb to politics to the detriment of the road program -- because it did not support the pet project of the chairman." He was referring to a Buckley proposal to have the Federal Government reimburse the states for the costs of highways built by them before the Interstate System got under way but later incorporated in it. The Public Works Committee June 3 approved a bill (HR 6303) to do this but it was never reported. It called for giving the states \$4,295,600,000 in reimbursement for 11,000 miles of roads, including the New York State Thruway. A provision stating Congress in principle approved of reimbursement was included in the 1959 highway financing bill (PL 86-342) but was stricken Sept. 3 on the House floor. (Weekly Report p. 1128, 1195)

Scherer said two members of the new Subcommittee, whom he did not identify, "have those qualifications and abilities which some people say are necessary for good hatchetmen." The 18 members: John A. Blatnik (D Minn.), chairman, George H. Fallon (D Md.), Robert E. Jones (D Ala.), Frank E. Smith (D Miss.), John C. Kluczynski (D Ill.), James C. Wright Jr. (D Texas), Kenneth J. Gray (D Ill.), Frank M. Clark (D Pa.), Ed Edmondson (D Okla.), Charles H. Brown (D Mo.), Harold T. Johnson (D Calif.), Robert E. Cook (D Ohio), Scherer, William C. Cramer (R Fla.), John F. Baldwin Jr. (R Calif.), Fred Schwengel (R Iowa), Howard W. Robison (R N.Y.) and Walter M. Mumma (R Pa.).

Scherer also said the special study on ways to reduce Interstate System costs, being conducted by Presidential Special Assistant Maj. Gen. John S. Bragdon (Ret.), would merely seek ways to justify decisions already made, namely, to cut Interstate projects in industrial and urban areas and to cut back design standards. Scherer said these changes would "cut the heart" out of the Interstate System and should not be approved before completion of two major surveys on the Interstate System due in 1961. (The Bureau of Public Roads was scheduled to send Congress in January 1962 an estimate of the cost of completing the Interstate System. In addition, the Commerce Department was scheduled to give Congress in January 1961 a final report on its highway cost allocation study, which had originally been scheduled for transmission to Congress in March 1959.)

Ralph R. Bartelsmeyer, Highway Officials president, also opposed urban and design cutbacks. Chairman Pat McNamara (D Mich.) of the Senate Public Works Public Roads Subcommittee told the association the "pay-as-you-go" provision should be scrapped.

Oct. 13 -- Blatnik, at the association meeting, said the new Subcommittee would spend two to four years investigating reports of graft and irregularities in the Federal highway programs. He said Scherer would "have to answer to his own colleagues" for his remarks.

Oct. 14 -- The Southern Governors' Conference, meeting in Asheville, N.C., adopted a resolution criticizing the contract controls on the Interstate System and calling on the Federal Government "to secure and guarantee the full 1960 commitments."

State-by-State Allocations for Federal Highway Programs

The Commerce Department Oct. 11 released a schedule of fiscal 1960 and fiscal 1961 allocations to the states for work on the primary, secondary and urban roads (ABC roads) program and on the National Interstate and Defense Highway System. Computations were made on the basis of money expected to be available in the Highway Trust Fund, which pays the Federal share of both programs. For the Interstate System, the allocations were lower than the maximums authorized by Congress. The Federal Government pays 50 percent of the cost of ABC roads construction and 90 percent of the cost of the Interstate System. Figures given below represent the Federal share.

| | Fiscal 1960 | | | Fiscal 1961 | | |
|--------------|----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|
| | ABC | Interstate | Total | ABC | Interstate | Total |
| Ala. | \$ 17,479,000 | \$ 34,742,000 | \$ 52,221,000 | \$ 16,715,402 | \$ 35,141,040 | \$ 51,856,442 |
| Alaska | 35,961,000 | ----- | 35,961,000 | 36,768,519 | ----- | 36,768,519 |
| Ariz. | 10,659,000 | 24,065,000 | 34,724,000 | 10,613,418 | 24,342,120 | 34,955,538 |
| Ark. | 12,553,000 | 17,494,000 | 30,047,000 | 11,993,122 | 17,695,260 | 29,688,382 |
| Calif. | 47,935,000 | 179,030,000 | 226,965,000 | 46,622,027 | 181,086,840 | 227,708,867 |
| Colo. | 13,865,000 | 13,654,000 | 27,519,000 | 13,461,726 | 13,810,500 | 27,272,226 |
| Conn. | 8,302,000 | 21,493,000 | 29,795,000 | 7,955,738 | 21,740,400 | 29,696,138 |
| Del. | 3,801,000 | 6,772,000 | 10,573,000 | 3,642,755 | 6,272,640 | 9,915,395 |
| D. C. | 5,277,000 | 17,459,000 | 22,736,000 | 5,057,506 | 17,659,620 | 22,717,126 |
| Fla. | 14,428,000 | 45,648,000 | 60,076,000 | 13,817,683 | 46,171,620 | 59,989,303 |
| Ga. | 20,015,000 | 42,512,000 | 62,527,000 | 19,162,437 | 42,999,660 | 62,162,097 |
| Hawaii | 4,095,000 | ----- | 4,095,000 | 3,924,455 | ----- | 3,924,455 |
| Idaho | 8,155,000 | 12,156,000 | 20,311,000 | 7,961,559 | 12,295,800 | 20,257,359 |
| Ill. | 38,906,000 | 90,343,000 | 129,249,000 | 37,569,048 | 91,380,960 | 128,950,008 |
| Ind. | 21,143,000 | 50,809,000 | 71,952,000 | 20,256,040 | 51,392,880 | 71,648,920 |
| Iowa | 18,463,000 | 16,719,000 | 35,182,000 | 17,658,947 | 16,911,180 | 34,570,127 |
| Kan. | 17,445,000 | 15,768,000 | 33,213,000 | 16,675,273 | 15,948,900 | 32,624,173 |
| Ky. | 15,424,000 | 30,972,000 | 46,396,000 | 14,749,616 | 31,327,560 | 46,077,176 |
| La. | 13,614,000 | 46,528,000 | 60,142,000 | 13,018,683 | 47,062,620 | 60,081,303 |
| Maine | 6,313,000 | 9,056,000 | 15,369,000 | 6,028,512 | 9,159,480 | 15,187,992 |
| Md. | 9,614,000 | 39,692,000 | 49,306,000 | 9,201,929 | 40,148,460 | 49,350,389 |
| Mass. | 16,411,000 | 49,065,000 | 65,476,000 | 15,721,010 | 49,628,700 | 65,349,710 |
| Mich. | 29,843,000 | 69,238,000 | 99,081,000 | 30,569,888 | 70,032,600 | 100,602,488 |
| Minn. | 20,883,000 | 33,209,000 | 54,092,000 | 21,261,070 | 33,590,700 | 54,851,770 |
| Miss. | 13,699,000 | 19,344,000 | 33,043,000 | 14,070,405 | 19,566,360 | 33,636,765 |
| Mo. | 23,686,000 | 50,263,000 | 73,949,000 | 22,638,658 | 50,840,460 | 73,479,118 |
| Mont. | 13,161,000 | 20,031,000 | 33,192,000 | 12,729,514 | 20,261,340 | 32,990,854 |
| Neb. | 13,901,000 | 15,324,000 | 29,225,000 | 13,263,598 | 10,994,940 | 24,258,538 |
| Nev. | 7,721,000 | 9,214,000 | 16,935,000 | 7,791,113 | 9,319,860 | 17,110,973 |
| N. H. | 4,005,000 | 9,690,000 | 13,695,000 | 4,116,021 | 9,801,000 | 13,917,021 |
| N. J. | 17,021,000 | 57,011,000 | 74,032,000 | 16,342,239 | 57,665,520 | 74,007,759 |
| N. M. | 11,497,000 | 21,106,000 | 32,603,000 | 11,291,509 | 21,348,360 | 32,639,869 |
| N. Y. | 56,175,000 | 87,260,000 | 143,435,000 | 53,755,978 | 88,262,460 | 142,018,438 |
| N. C. | 20,894,000 | 19,158,000 | 40,052,000 | 19,997,881 | 9,658,440 | 29,656,321 |
| N. D. | 9,418,000 | 7,804,000 | 17,222,000 | 8,982,538 | 7,894,260 | 16,876,798 |
| Ohio | 34,954,000 | 114,761,000 | 149,715,000 | 33,473,020 | 116,079,480 | 149,552,500 |
| Okla. | 16,568,000 | 16,014,000 | 32,582,000 | 15,843,900 | 16,198,380 | 32,042,280 |
| Ore. | 12,648,000 | 30,531,000 | 43,179,000 | 12,378,962 | 30,882,060 | 43,261,022 |
| Pa. | 42,604,000 | 71,845,000 | 114,449,000 | 40,819,031 | 72,669,960 | 113,488,991 |
| R. I. | 4,943,000 | 8,210,000 | 13,153,000 | 4,741,918 | 8,304,120 | 13,046,038 |
| S. C. | 11,259,000 | 14,517,000 | 25,776,000 | 11,571,897 | 14,683,680 | 26,255,577 |
| S. D. | 10,125,000 | 13,076,000 | 23,201,000 | 9,871,273 | 7,555,680 | 17,426,953 |
| Tenn. | 18,043,000 | 52,254,000 | 70,297,000 | 17,262,501 | 52,854,120 | 70,116,621 |
| Texas | 51,400,000 | 79,597,000 | 130,997,000 | 49,068,867 | 80,510,760 | 129,579,627 |
| Utah | 8,413,000 | 16,473,000 | 24,886,000 | 8,646,670 | 16,661,700 | 25,308,370 |
| Vt. | 3,690,000 | 16,613,000 | 20,303,000 | 3,536,715 | 16,804,260 | 20,340,975 |
| Va. | 16,742,000 | 74,645,000 | 91,387,000 | 16,024,294 | 75,503,340 | 91,527,634 |
| Wash. | 14,043,000 | 31,905,000 | 45,948,000 | 13,596,329 | 32,272,020 | 45,868,349 |
| W. Va. | 9,460,000 | 22,074,000 | 31,534,000 | 9,054,553 | 22,328,460 | 31,383,013 |
| Wis. | 19,764,000 | 18,551,000 | 38,315,000 | 18,907,300 | 18,764,460 | 37,671,760 |
| Wyo. | 8,333,000 | 18,305,000 | 26,638,000 | 8,189,918 | 18,514,980 | 26,704,898 |
| P. R. | 6,249,000 | ----- | 6,249,000 | 5,989,953 | ----- | 5,989,953 |
| TOTAL | \$900,000,000 | \$1,800,000,000 | \$2,700,000,000 | \$925,000,000 | \$1,800,000,000 | \$2,725,000,000 |

SPACE RACE

The U.S. Army Oct. 14 announced the first successful firing of a Nike-Zeus anti-missile missile at White Sands, N.M. Spokesmen said that although the firing fell short of its planned trajectory, both the first and second stages of the missile performed successfully and "yielded the desired technical data." The test was aimed at learning flight and propulsion characteristics, and the Army said the first stage carried the "most powerful known single unit solid propellant rocket motor ever fired." In its first test Aug. 26 the Nike-Zeus missile blew up in mid-air.

The firing followed by one day two successful space tests at Cape Canaveral, Fla. A 91.5-pound satellite -- Explorer VII -- was launched into orbit Oct. 13 to study cosmic radiation. The National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) said the gyroscope-shaped satellite probably would stay aloft 20 years. It was the last satellite of the U.S. International Geophysical Year program.

Shortly before its launching, a B-47 jet bomber fired a 37-foot ballistic missile into space across the path of another satellite, the Explorer VI, which went into orbit Aug. 7. Officially known as a "rocket-powered strategic air-to-surface missile," the weapon would be used for long-range attack and to catch and destroy orbiting satellites.

The Air Force Oct. 6 announced successful firings of Atlas and Thor missiles on full-range flights aimed at proving the accuracy and reliability of the weapons.

SUPREME COURT

The U.S. Supreme Court reconvened Oct. 12 after a three-month recess. It took these major actions:

Refused to reconsider two 1958 decisions (Barenblatt and Uphaus) upholding the right of the House Un-American Activities Committee and of the states to investigate Communist activities. (Weekly Report p. 1312, 1314)

Agreed to consider, along with the Scales case, a second case (Noto) testing the membership clause of the 1940 Smith Act. (For related case, Weekly Report p. 1312)

Agreed to consider a case (De Veau v. Braisted) challenging the constitutionality of a New York law barring convicted felons from holding union office. The 1959 Federal labor reform law (PL 86-257) contained a similar provision. (Weekly Report p. 1194)

Agreed to review the May 8, 1959 Georgia supreme court decision in the Looper case, holding that a contract requiring employees to join a union was unconstitutional if the union used dues money to support political causes opposed by the members. (Weekly Report p. 767)

Refused to review two North Carolina court decisions (Holt v. Raleigh and Covington v. Edwards) upholding the state's public school pupil placement law.

Refused to review the decision of a lower Federal court (Goldsby case) holding that the absence of Negroes from the Carroll County, Miss., voting lists, from which criminal juries were selected, constituted systematic exclusion of Negroes from juries, and therefore invalidated the conviction of a Negro by an all-white jury.

Began hearings on the Federal Government's claim that the 1953 Submerged Lands Act (PL 83-31) did not give states ownership of submerged lands that were more than three miles off their shores. Five states -- Texas, Louisiana, Mississippi, Alabama and Florida -- said the act gave them ownership of submerged land (and its

mineral wealth, chiefly oil) for three leagues (about 10 miles) off shore. (1953 Almanac p. 388)

SEPTEMBER UNEMPLOYMENT

The Labor Department Oct. 13 reported that unemployment in September dropped by 196,000 to 3,230,000. The drop was attributed largely to the withdrawal from the labor market of students returning to school. The same reason was given for an 894,000 drop in the total number employed, to 66,347,000.

CIVIL RIGHTS

Former Virginia Gov. John S. Battle (D 1950-54) Oct. 12 resigned from the Federal Civil Rights Commission. Battle was one of the six original commissioners appointed by President Eisenhower Nov. 7, 1957. Battle made his resignation effective at the "pleasure" of President Eisenhower, who had requested him to stay on. Congress Sept. 15 extended the life of the commission for two years. (Weekly Report p. 1282)

Following a meeting of the commission Oct. 14, Chairman John A. Hannah announced that he and the other four commissioners would continue to serve. Hannah said the commission would continue to place primary emphasis on investigating discrimination in the voting, housing and education fields.

He said it might also look into administration of justice and employment opportunities.

Hannah said the commission had asked the Justice Department to expedite an appeal to the Supreme Court of the Oct. 7 Federal court decision barring commission hearings in Louisiana. (Weekly Report p. 1390)

He said the commission would schedule no further public hearings on voting complaints until the appeal was heard.

INTER-AMERICAN BANK

President Eisenhower Oct. 14 appointed Robert Cutler, Boston banker and special Presidential assistant on national security affairs in 1953-58, as the United States member of the new Inter-American Development Bank's board of executive directors. Cutler's term of office was three years. A formal nomination was scheduled to go to Congress when it reconvened in January 1960.

The White House also announced that Secretary of the Treasury Robert B. Anderson would serve as the bank's governor and that Under Secretary of State C. Douglas Dillon would be his alternate.

Congress in July approved legislation (S 1928 -- PL 147) authorizing U.S. membership in the \$1 billion bank, and Anderson Oct. 14 ratified the membership with the deposit of a \$450,000 check as the first installment of the U.S. \$450 million commitment. Argentina also ratified its membership, depositing \$113,454. The bank was scheduled to begin operations when 85 percent of its total capital was committed. (Weekly Report p. 1051)

RELATED DEVELOPMENT -- Oct. 3 -- The U.S. Export-Import Bank reported that in its first 25 years it had earned \$478 million and built its reserves to \$550 million. The report said the bank had loaned \$10 billion since 1934, with only \$2.9 million charged off as uncollectible. Loans outstanding on June 30 totalled \$3.5 billion. The report, prepared for Congress, said although "the greatest activity has continued to be in the countries of Latin America it is fair to say that the effects of the bank's loans have been felt in every corner of the world."

STEEL STRIKE

President Eisenhower Oct. 9 invoked the Taft-Hartley Act in the deadlocked steel strike which began July 15 and appointed a three-man board of inquiry to investigate the dispute. The board, originally scheduled to report to the President Oct. 16, was granted an Oct. 14 request for a three-day extension, until Oct. 19, after it said it was having "great difficulty" in defining and analyzing the issues. (Weekly Report p. 1391)

Heading the board of inquiry was George W. Taylor, a University of Pennsylvania labor relations professor who was chairman of the War Labor Board in World War II and of the Wage Stabilization Board in the Korean War. Other members were John Perkins, president of the University of Delaware, and Paul N. Lehoczy, Ohio State University professor.

Taylor Oct. 14 said the board hoped it could "avoid the necessity of making a report to the President." A report is a prerequisite for any Government request for a Taft-Hartley Act injunction to halt a strike for an 80-day cooling-off period.

After a series of hearings with representatives of industry and the United Steelworkers Union, Taylor Oct. 15 said the panel believed the major blocks to a settlement were the work rule changes demanded by the industry to cut costs and wage and benefit increases asked by strikers. United Steelworkers Union (AFL-CIO) President David J. McDonald Oct. 14 told the board the wage and benefit demands were "negotiable," but on Oct. 15 he said the union would not back down on its refusal to accept work rule changes.

Taylor Oct. 15 told both sides that if they were unable to reach agreement by negotiation they should consider arbitration, but both steel and union spokesmen said they preferred negotiation. He scheduled a final hearing for Oct. 18.

In invoking the Taft-Hartley Act, president Eisenhower issued a statement expressing his "profound regret" that the strike had not been settled by collective bargaining. He emphasized that his action "in no way relieves the parties of their grave obligations...to resume negotiations and reach a just and responsible settlement," and said the national interest "demands an immediate resumption of production in this vital industry." (For text see p. 1413)

It was the second time in four days Mr. Eisenhower had invoked the act and the 17th use of the measure since 1947. He invoked it Oct. 6 in a two-coast dock strike.

Commenting on the President's action, Sen. John F. Kennedy (D Mass.) Oct. 10 said it was "the most one-sided, unfortunate and unfair action in this Administration's history." Sen. Stephen M. Young (D Ohio) Oct. 10 said it was a slap in the face of the union designed "to shatter the morale and aims of the strikers." AFL-CIO President George Meany Oct. 13 said it would be "immoral" to enjoin the strike at "the very time that the scales are beginning to balance."

RELATED DEVELOPMENT -- Oct. 12 -- The United Steelworkers Union released an Oct. 7 letter from former President Harry S. Truman to McDonald stating he "felt that these people with whom you are dealing do not want a fair and just settlement," and urging the union to "keep fighting."

PRESIDENT EISENHOWER

President Eisenhower Oct. 14 celebrated his 69th birthday and thereby became the third oldest man ever to serve as President. Andrew Jackson (1829-37) was 69 years 11½ months old when he left office; James Buchanan (1857-61) was 69 years 9½ months old when he retired. If Mr. Eisenhower completes his remaining 14½ months in office he will retire as the oldest man ever to serve as President.

In Abilene, Kan., Oct. 13 for the ground-breaking ceremony of the Eisenhower Presidential Library, the President called for worldwide reduction of armaments, with money saved to be used to improve living standards in underdeveloped nations. (For text see p. 1414)

WORLD'S FAIR

The President Oct. 10 appointed a three-member World's Fair Site Selection Committee to recommend a site for a world's fair in the United States in 1964. The appointees were Charles Sawyer, former Secretary of Commerce (1948-52); Harry Bullis, former board chairman of General Mills; and Aksel Nielson, director of several business organizations. (Weekly Report p. 1282)

AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL

Elwood R. Quesada, administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency, Oct. 7 outlined plans to develop a unified air traffic control system by transferring to the FAA most of the air control operations handled by the military. Quesada, in disclosing the program -- called "Project Friendship" -- in a speech at the fourth annual meeting of the Air Traffic Control Assn. at Oklahoma City, Okla., said the Department of Defense was "in complete agreement with this principle."

Under the program, the FAA would assume operation of about 2,095 air traffic control facilities at 337 locations, he said, of which 98 were outside the U.S. Quesada said the FAA discovered that the operation of the 2,095 facilities required 20,000 military personnel. "We have estimated we can do the job with approximately 13,300 persons," he said. Air traffic control related to tactical operations and air warfare training, however, would remain with the military, he said. Quesada estimated the FAA could absorb other military flight control services by mid-1960 and accomplish the entire transfer by 1963.

Quesada said the unified control system, once in operation, would offer better service, increased safety, greater economy and increased combat capability for the military.

The FAA, created by Congress in 1958, was given authority to regulate use of the national airspace, establish air traffic rules, and develop and coordinate air navigation facilities for both civil and military aircraft. (1958 Almanac p. 233)

DEFENSE MANPOWER

Assistant Secretary of Defense Charles C. Finucane Oct. 3 said the Navy and Air Force would reduce their manpower in fiscal 1961 in order to stay within their budget limitations. He said that the cuts, anticipated at 5,000 men for each service, would permit more money to be spent on missiles and equipment.

Finucane said the Army certainly "would not volunteer" to drop below its 870,000-man authorization.

CONGRESS CLOSED 30% OF COMMITTEE MEETINGS

The first session of the 86th Congress was notable for a sharp reduction in committee secrecy in comparison with the sessions from 1953-58.

A Congressional Quarterly survey revealed that Congress in 1959 excluded the press and the public from fewer than 30 percent of its committee meetings -- the lowest figure since 1953. Of 1,639 meetings held by House committees between Jan. 7 and Sept. 15, when the session ended, 434 (or 26 percent) were held in executive (closed) session. Of 1,350 Senate committee gatherings during the same period, 433 (or 32 percent) were held behind closed doors. In all, Congress closed 29.6 percent of its 3,152 committee meetings during the 1959 session.

The total number of meetings during 1959 was itself a notable figure. It was the second highest total recorded for a first session (and the third highest for any session) since Congressional Quarterly began its tally of open-closed meetings in 1953. Because of the reorganization of committees at the start of every new Congress, most committees do not meet as often during the first session as they do in the second.

Following is a year-by-year breakdown of open and closed committee meetings since 1953:

| Year | Total Meetings | Number Closed | Percent Closed |
|------|----------------|---------------|----------------|
| 1953 | 2,640 | 892 | 35 |
| 1954 | 3,002 | 1,243 | 41 |
| 1955 | 2,940 | 1,055 | 36 |
| 1956 | 3,120 | 1,130 | 36 |
| 1957 | 3,251 | 1,103 | 34 |
| 1958 | 3,472 | 1,167 | 34 |
| 1959 | 3,152 | 940 | 30 |

Commenting on the decline in closed hearings since the high of 41 percent in 1954, Sevellon Brown, Chairman of the Freedom of Information Committee of the American Society of Newspaper Editors and editor of the Providence (R.I.) Journal and Bulletin said: "The downward trend in closed Congressional committee meetings as recorded by Congressional Quarterly should be gratifying to every newspaper and newspaperman in the country. It should be remembered, however, that the fight against Government secrecy has not ended. It will be the job of a free American press to see that the trend continues."

Congressional Quarterly's tabulations are based on information appearing in the Daily Digest section of the Congressional Record. According to Section 221 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946: "The Joint Committee on Printing is authorized and directed to provide for printing in the Daily Record (the Daily Digest of the Congressional Record)...a list of Congressional committee hearings and meetings, and the place of meeting and subject matter; and to cause a brief resume of Congressional activities for the previous day to be incorporated in the Record."

Each committee decides when it will bar the public from its sessions. While most of the committees report

all their meetings for publication in the Record, a few fail to report their executive sessions.

A spokesman for the House Select Small Business Committee told CQ that several executive sessions were held by the Committee but not reported because Section 221 was interpreted as applying only to public hearings.

The House Un-American Activities Committee said it had reported none of its closed hearings because of the possibility that witnesses appearing in secret session might receive unfavorable publicity. The Committee did not estimate the number of such hearings in 1959.

The busiest of all Congressional committees -- House Appropriations -- did not report any of its executive sessions during 1959. The 15 subcommittees which make up the full Committee traditionally go over money requests in private because Chairman Clarence Cannon (D Mo.) believes the Committee gets more work done this way and makes better use of its limited office space.

Individual Committees

Of the Congressional committees logging more than 50 meetings during the 1959 session, six held more than half in executive session. Four of the six committees -- House Foreign Affairs, Senate Foreign Relations, Senate Armed Services and Joint Atomic Energy -- gave national security precautions as a reason for the high degree of secrecy. The six committees were:

House Foreign Affairs, which closed 86 of its 118 meetings (73 percent); Senate Foreign Relations, which closed 74 of its 124 meetings (60 percent); Senate Armed Services, which closed 44 of its 77 meetings (57 percent); Joint Atomic Energy, which closed 59 of its 110 meetings (54 percent); House Ways and Means, which closed 54 of its 101 sessions (53 percent); and Senate Finance, which closed 27 of its 52 meetings (52 percent).

Ground Rules

The tabulations in the chart on the next page excluded: meetings when Congress was not in regular session; meetings outside Washington, D.C.; meetings of conference committees to reconcile conflicting Senate and House versions of bills; informal meetings without official status; meetings of the House Rules Committee to consider sending legislation to the floor, but Rules Committee meetings for other purposes were included; meetings of House Appropriations Committee.

Open meetings followed by closed meeting were counted twice -- once in each category. Joint meetings of two separate committees were counted twice -- once for each committee. Morning and afternoon sessions of the same committee were counted only once if the committee covered the same subject in both sessions. The figures are based on information appearing in the Daily Digests of the Congressional Record and that obtained from the committees.

CLOSED AND OPEN CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Committees Bar Public from 30 Percent of Sessions

| | 1957 (Jan. 3 - Aug. 31) | | | | 1958 (Jan. 7 - Aug. 24) | | | | 1959 (Jan. 7 - Sept. 15) | | | |
|--------------------------------|-------------------------|--------------|--------------|-------------------|-------------------------|--------------|--------------|-------------------|--------------------------|------------|--------------|-------------------|
| | OPEN | CLOSED | TOTAL | PERCENT CLOSED | OPEN | CLOSED | TOTAL | PERCENT CLOSED | OPEN | CLOSED | TOTAL | PERCENT CLOSED |
| Senate Committees | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Aeronautics and Space Sciences | -- | -- | -- | -- | 7 | 4 | 11 | 36% | 18 | 11 | 29 | 38% |
| Agriculture | 35 | 24 | 59 | 41% | 61 | 19 | 80 | 24 | 24 | 21 | 45 | 47 |
| Appropriations | 137 | 57 | 194 | 29 | 125 | 47 | 172 | 27 | 131 | 51 | 182 | 28 |
| Armed Services | 44 | 55 | 99 | 56 | 59 | 47 | 106 | 44 | 33 | 44 | 77 | 57 |
| Banking and Currency | 64 | 30 | 94 | 32 | 32 | 11 | 43 | 26 | 54 | 15 | 69 | 22 |
| Commerce | 64 | 34 | 98 | 35 | 98 | 17 | 115 | 15 | 93 | 27 | 120 | 23 |
| District of Columbia | 42 | 18 | 60 | 30 | 31 | 3 | 34 | 9 | 38 | 11 | 49 | 22 |
| Finance | 44 | 16 | 60 | 27 | 35 | 30 | 65 | 46 | 25 | 27 | 52 | 52 |
| Foreign Relations | 41 | 64 | 105 | 61 | 45 | 55 | 100 | 55 | 50 | 74 | 124 | 60 |
| Government Operations | 21 | 8 | 29 | 28 | 22 | 7 | 29 | 24 | 28 | 11 | 39 | 28 |
| Interior and Insular Affairs | 78 | 25 | 103 | 24 | 61 | 21 | 82 | 26 | 46 | 25 | 71 | 35 |
| Judiciary | 163 | 48 | 211 | 23 | 141 | 49 | 190 | 26 | 157 | 32 | 189 | 17 |
| Labor and Public Welfare | 36 | 19 | 55 | 35 | 59 | 19 | 78 | 24 | 91 | 36 | 127 | 28 |
| Post Office and Civil Service | 26 | 12 | 38 | 32 | 27 | 13 | 40 | 32 | 25 | 10 | 35 | 29 |
| Public Works | 53 | 20 | 73 | 27 | 34 | 17 | 51 | 33 | 21 | 13 | 34 | 38 |
| Rules and Administration | 10 | 22 | 32 | 69 | 6 | 15 | 21 | 71 | 5 | 19 | 24 | 79 |
| Select Natural Water Resources | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | 4 | 1 | 5 | 20 |
| Select Small Business | 19 | 2 | 21 | 10 | 12 | 8 | 20 | 40 | 18 | 1 | 19 | 5 |
| Select Labor-Management | 64 | 2 | 66 | 3 | 79 | 9 | 88 | 10 | 56 | 4 | 60 | 7 |
| TOTAL | 953 | 470 | 1,423 | 33% | 934 | 391 | 1,325 | 29% | 917 | 433 | 1,350 | 32% |
| House Committees | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Agriculture | 103 | 32 | 135 | 24% | 103 | 53 | 156 | 34% | 110 | 39 | 149 | 26% |
| Armed Services | 135 | 34 | 169 | 20 | 102 | 93 | 195 | 48 | 120 | 31 | 151 | 21 |
| Banking and Currency | 41 | 15 | 56 | 27 | 77 | 61 | 138 | 44 | 48 | 14 | 62 | 23 |
| Commerce | 109 | 38 | 147 | 26 | 115 | 41 | 156 | 26 | 128 | 20 | 148 | 14 |
| District of Columbia | 40 | 21 | 61 | 34 | 31 | 13 | 44 | 29 | 39 | 7 | 46 | 15 |
| Education and Labor | 108 | 21 | 129 | 16 | 108 | 53 | 161 | 33 | 83 | 23 | 106 | 22 |
| Foreign Affairs | 34 | 68 | 102 | 67 | 61 | 55 | 116 | 47 | 32 | 86 | 118 | 73 |
| Government Operations | 100 | 32 | 132 | 24 | 110 | 39 | 149 | 26 | 61 | 11 | 72 | 15 |
| House Administration | 9 | 11 | 20 | 55 | 16 | 23 | 39 | 59 | 9 | 11 | 20 | 55 |
| Interior and Insular Affairs | 130 | 21 | 151 | 14 | 111 | 39 | 150 | 26 | 131 | 15 | 146 | 10 |
| Judiciary | 80 | 89 | 169 | 53 | 97 | 80 | 177 | 45 | 111 | 61 | 172 | 35 |
| Merchant Marine and Fisheries | 49 | 24 | 73 | 33 | 59 | 29 | 88 | 33 | 75 | 13 | 88 | 15 |
| Post Office and Civil Service | 69 | 23 | 92 | 25 | 63 | 31 | 94 | 33 | 60 | 12 | 72 | 17 |
| Public Works | 25 | 34 | 59 | 58 | 39 | 42 | 81 | 52 | 40 | 13 | 53 | 37 |
| Rules | 16 | 7 | 23 | 30 | 27 | 3 | 30 | 10 | 15 | 0 | 15 | 0 |
| Science and Astronautics | -- | -- | -- | -- | 21 | 8 | 29 | 27 | 80 | 20 | 100 | 20 |
| Select Small Business | 25 | 4 | 29 | 14 | 31 | 6 | 37 | 16 | ? | ? | ? | ? |
| Un-American Activities | 28 | ? | ? | ? | 5 | 7 | 12 | 58 | ? | ? | ? | ? |
| Veterans' Affairs | 33 | 7 | 40 | 18 | 57 | 19 | 76 | 25 | 16 | 4 | 20 | 20 |
| Ways and Means | 11 | 79 | 90 | 88 | 75 | 42 | 117 | 36 | 47 | 54 | 101 | 53 |
| TOTAL | 1,145 | 560 | 1,705 | 33% | 1,308 | 737 | 2,045 | 36% | 1,205 | 434 | 1,639 | 26% |
| Joint Committees | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Atomic Energy | 34 | 59 | 93 | 63% | 41 | 27 | 68 | 40% | 51 | 59 | 110 | 54 |
| Defense Production | 3 | 1 | 4 | 25 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 75 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 67 |
| Economic Report | 13 | 10 | 23 | 43 | 18 | 6 | 24 | 25 | 37 | 5 | 42 | 12 |
| Others | 0 | 3 | 3 | 100 | 3 | 3 | 6 | 50 | 1 | 7 | 8 | 88 |
| TOTAL | 50 | 73 | 123 | 59% | 63 | 39 | 102 | 38% | 90 | 73 | 163 | 45% |
| Grand Total | 2,148 | 1,103 | 3,251 | 34% | 2,305 | 1,167 | 3,472 | 34% | 2,212 | 940 | 3,152 | 30% |



Party Unity Democrats and Republicans clashed on exactly one-half of the 302 roll-call votes of 1959 -- a record of partisanship unmatched since 1956, CQ's annual study of Party Unity shows. With top-heavy majorities in Senate and House, Democrats won 109 of the 151 partisan showdowns, lost the remaining 42 through defections. On the average, both Democrats and Republicans voted with their respective majorities on three of every four party-line roll calls. But Sen. Frank J. Lausche (D Ohio) beat all records for defection by voting with the Republicans 83 percent of the time. (Page 1393)

Republican Program

The Republican Committee on Programs and Progress completed its statement of long-term GOP aims with reports covering the areas of Human Rights and Needs and Economic Opportunity and Progress. The reports pledged to "lift the ceiling over personal opportunity (and) strengthen the floor over the pit of personal disaster." Policy stands included support for Federal aid to school construction and opposition to compulsory Federal old-age hospital and medical insurance. (Page 1409)

Highway Program

In the midst of sharp and continuing controversy on how to finance the Interstate Highway program, the Commerce Department released a state-by-state schedule of allocations for the program for fiscal 1960 and 1961. President Eisenhower replied to criticism of Administration highway policy and a GOP member of the House Public Works Committee suggested a new subcommittee was preparing to do a hatchet job on the road program. (Page 1416)

Lobbying and Taxes

The Internal Revenue Service has proposed new regulations to clarify just what types of advertising and lobbying expenses are deductible from taxable income. Business and labor groups say the new rules would sharply curtail their right to speak out on public issues. National trade organizations fear the proposed regulations would discourage contributions. (Page 1405)

The Congressional Record

The Congressional Record supposedly is the word-for-word record of debate on the Senate and House floors. But Members of Congress can "revise" their remarks as they wish before they are printed in the record. This practice, however, is meeting with increased opposition within Congress itself. (Page 1415)

Committee Secrecy Down

Congressional Quarterly statistics show that Congress in 1959 barred the press and the public from less than 30 percent of its committee meetings -- the lowest secrecy mark recorded since 1953. Between Jan. 7 and Sept. 15, when the 1959 session ended, the Senate closed 433 of its 1,350 committee meetings and the House locked the doors on 434 of 1,639 gatherings. Joint committees of the House and Senate held 163 meetings, 73 of them in private. (Page 1420)

Nuclear Hazards

Safeguards against harmful nuclear radiation are being sought on both the legislative and executive fronts. Despite wide differences of opinion on the danger from radiation, worldwide concern has continued to mount as radiation hazards grow because of increased use of X-rays, ever-broadening uses of atomic energy, accumulating industrial nuclear waste and debris and fallout from nuclear weapon testing. Recent Congressional hearings have studied major aspects of the problem and the Federal Radiation Council is expected to set up new radiation protection standards. (Page 1398)

Civil Defense

"The total unreadiness of the American people to survive a nuclear war -- which is well known both to the Russians and to our allies -- can greatly undermine our capability to resist possible Soviet nuclear blackmail." That was the major finding of a recent report by the Joint Atomic Energy Special Radiation Subcommittee. Though U.S. experts formerly thought the Nation would suffer at least 50 million to 70 million casualties in the event of an all-out nuclear war, new studies and reports and the interest of two Presidential hopefuls -- Nelson A. Rockefeller and Hubert H. Humphrey -- are sparking optimism that a good civilian defense program can cut casualties sharply. (Page 1403)